# JESUS
## AS PROBLEM, TEACHER, PERSONALITY AND FORCE

M3

G. M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
2700 GLENWAY AVE.
P. O. BOX 04320
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45204-3200
88-C
J-1

To

Dad

Partlet.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/jesusasproblemte0000wbor

# Jesus
AS
PROBLEM, TEACHER, PERSONALITY
AND FORCE

# JESUS,

AS

# PROBLEM, TEACHER, PERSONALITY AND FORCE

Four Lectures

BY

W. BORNEMANN, W. VEIT, H. SCHUSTER
AND E. FOERSTER

Authorized Translation from the German by

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE

Associate Editor, "The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge"

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

NEW YORK AND LONDON

1910

Copyright, 1910, by
Funk & Wagnalls Company
[Printed in the United States of America]
Published in September, 1910

## CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| Translator's Preface | | vii |
| Preface | | xi |
| I. | Jesus as Problem, by Senior Professor W. Bornemann, Th.D. | 3 |
| II. | Jesus as Teacher, by Pastor W. Veit | 65 |
| III. | Jesus as Personality, by Head Master H. Schuster | 119 |
| IV. | Jesus as Force, by Pastor E. Foerster, Th.D. | 191 |

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Since the authors of the lectures here translated are not yet well known in America, a word of introduction should be accorded. Senior Professor Friedrich Wilhelm Bernhard Bornemann, Th. D., born in 1858, was a pupil of Ritschl, and received his education at Göttingen and Leipsic. He has taught in the University of Göttingen, in the cloister school at Magdeburg, and in the University of Basel. Since 1902 he has been pastor at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and senior since 1906. He has written on general and theological education and on missions, and has furnished a commentary on Thessalonians.

Pastor Willy Veit, who was born at Frankfort in 1872, studied at Erlangen and Berlin, served as pastor of the German Church at Manchester, England, from 1898 till 1905, and since 1905 has been pastor of St. Katharine's at Frankfort and editor of *Die Gemeinde,* the organ there of "modern" theology.

Head Master Herrmann Schuster was born at Uelzen in Hannover in 1874, studied at Göttingen and Greifswald, was tutor at Buenos Ayres from 1896 until 1899, and since 1900 has taught at Göttingen and in the gymnasium of Frankfort. At Easter of 1910 he removed to Hannover.

Pastor Erich Foerster, Th. D., was born at Greifswald in 1865, was a pupil of Harnack, studying at Marburg and Berlin, and since 1895 has been pastor of the German Evangelical Reformed Church at Frankfort, where since 1907 he has taught church history in the academy. He is editor of *Chronik der christlichen Welt,* and author of a number of little books dealing with the relations of Church and State.

At the time of the delivery of these lectures, all these men were residents of the flourishing commercial city of Frankfort. They belonged there to a circle which goes by the name of "Friends of the Christian World." Theologically, they own affiliation with the new Ritschlian school, of which Adolf Harnack is the best known representative. The object of this school and circle is the reconciliation of a "modern" theology,

so scientifically constructed as to be a permanent acquisition, with the historical practical Christianity which dominates the western world and aims at the conquest of the East. This is to be accomplished by rejecting the obsoletisms of a decadent orthodoxy which repel the modern thinker, and by refuting a radical rationalism which assails not only Christianity but religion itself. The basis is found in rigid application of the canons of historical criticism to the original records of Christianity and in attention to the data that are given by a profound psychology and by Christian experience.

The present lectures strike a note not very familiar to American readers, one object being to defend the "historical Jesus" against the new mythical theory proposed by Professor Arthur Drews. The little volume will be found full of suggestion, both for the pulpit and the pew, while here and here such delightful insights into the mind and method of Jesus Christ are afforded as will well repay perusal.

THE TRANSLATOR.

# PREFACE

After the four authors of these lectures had twice appeared in a lecture series before the Frankfort public, we were bold enough in October and November of this year to offer the following lectures. Our addresses have found response, and from year to year the number of auditors has increased; this year it was granted to us to fill each evening one of the largest halls in the city. For this we are profoundly thankful. The assurance is borne in upon us that gradually the work of modern theology is winning the confidence of the thinking and the earnest among our people. While we can hardly hope to be able to set forth perfected and conclusive results, we assume to address ourselves with full scientific honesty and rigor to the great question which the heritage of the past and responsibility for the future bring to us. It is our ambition, however, not merely to deal with interesting scientific problems; we would also serve Christian piety. We are less concerned to hold a brief for modern

theology than to spread knowledge of the unspeakably rich and great treasure with which the world has been endowed in the person of Jesus Christ, and to inspire in men the courage from henceforth to draw upon this fullness. May the printed word attain this end, which the spoken word also attempted to gain.

THE AUTHORS.

Frankfort-on-the-Main, Advent, 1909.

# Jesus As Problem

BY

Senior Professor W. Bornemann, Th.D.

# I

## JESUS AS PROBLEM

The task which our "circle of friends" has set itself in this year's course of lectures* is indicated by the single name Jesus. Present conditions make it an imperative necessity for us to consider in public this weightiest and most central theme of the Christian religion. The greatness of the task, which will probably never be fully accomplished, and certainly can not be compassed within the narrow limits afforded by four lectures, creates in us much hesitation. Yet, so far as our abilities permit, we offer our answer with cheerful alacrity and in the consciousness that we point out to our hearers a road that may be travelled, one from which indeed not all the difficulties are removed, but which leads on to a free and at the same time

* In the autumn of 1907 the present speakers lectured on "The Religious Ideals of Modern Theology," in 1908 on "May Religion Remain an Affair of the Individual?" Both these lecture-courses were published (Frankfort, 1908-1909).

scientific and religious-ethical understanding. It is my task now to prepare, indicate, and mark out this road; I have to justify its character and direction while I speak frankly of all the difficulties which present themselves in the performance of our task, depotentialize certain objections which would in advance brand our undertaking as foolish and superfluous, and, still further, define the meaning, bounds, and end of our program.

## I

My theme expresses the fact that the person of Jesus does not mean for us a dogma that is clearly fixed for all time and set forth with divine infallibility; what that personality suggests is that it is a problem. By this is meant that Jesus in the days of his earthly activities as well as in the entire subsequent spiritual history up to the present has suggested something unsettled, and that this was not alien to his purpose and was in the very nature of things. Moreover we are convinced that a Jesus who first of all is realized by the earnest conscience as a difficulty and a question is for the individual, as for mankind at large, more fruitful and richer

in blessing than the Jesus of early church dogma, though this dogma was supposed to have removed completely all occasion for question and for doubt.

Goethe, when he was at odds with Lavater, on September 4th, 1788, wrote to Herder as follows: "It is indeed true that the story of Jesus is one of those primitive causes of such a kind that the world may exist for ten thousand years and then no one will come to a right understanding of it; for it takes as much force of knowledge and understanding, and as high power of conception to defend it as to assail it." As an old man, less positive and less bold, he expressed the same idea in a discussion with Chancellor Müller, June 8, 1830, in the words: "Christ remains for me ever an extremely significant but extremely enigmatic being." More intelligibly still has Rudolph Eucken characterized the situation*: "From the point of view of the total impression, Jesus is more thoroughly transparent and familiar than any hero of world-history. But this sense of nearness and familiarity persists only so long as we take that

* *Die Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker,* 7th ed., Leipsic, 1907.

total impression absolutely and as a unity; as soon as we analyze it, as soon as we would explain and understand the state of fact, his personality withdraws to a far distance, question rises upon question, riddle upon riddle obtrudes, and secure possession is transformed into toilsome search."

Grave injustice is done to theologians in the charge which is often publicly made that, consciously or unconsciously, they are accustomed to deny this condition of things or to veil it. The fact is the contrary of this; practically every theologian experiences what Eucken has expressed, so much so that through orthodox circles runs the perception that theological study makes of the person of Jesus first of all a problem, and it is this very thing which so disturbs the pious layman and fills him with distrust. As a matter of fact, the very existence of a Christian dogmatics and ethics is evidence that the person of Jesus both can and indeed must become the object of scientific investigation. The history of doctrine speaks to us of the manifold development and treatment of the problem. Exegesis of the New Testament and the attempt, so often repeated in the last century,

to give a representation of the life of Jesus prove that the so-called "Biblical Jesus" furnishes for investigation much of difficulty and of questioning. Moreover preaching, ecclesiastical instruction, and church hymnody reveal unmistakably in their history the truth that to every age and to every thinking man the personality of Jesus is a recurring problem. We may omit from our survey the theologians who, according to the prejudice of so many even cultured people, not to speak of the half educated, look down upon the world from their "captive balloon" of ecclesiastical dogma or, worse still, live out their existence like purblind moles in a tunnel of foggy thought. If we cast our eyes upon those who are untrammelled by any regard for Church and office and not infrequently are actuated by hostility to ecclesiastical teaching, who have nevertheless stood out as guides in the spiritual life of modern man, or upon those whose interests are not primarily religious, but rather philosophical, literary, or concerned with art or the social side of life, it will be found that they are ever drawn anew and enchained by the mysterious might of the Nazarene. These

men have been constantly impelled, even to the present, to try to solve the riddle of his personality and have returned answers of manifold form. One may go further and note that the world of workers also halts before his form, regarding it with eager questioning gaze.

I shall not enumerate the names of those who have attempted the problem. Omitting all mention of the insignificant, the fanatical, the mere pamphleteers, one can recall a great roll of our most eminent poets, thinkers, artists, and authors whom the subject has tempted. A guide to him who would in brief time and cursorily gain information here is furnished by the brochure of Professor Hermann Jordan, *Jesus und die modernen Jesusbilder,* published in the *Zeit- und Streitfragen* series (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1909).* A more pro-

* The settlement with the liberal theology in this treatise by Jordan seems to me exceedingly weak. In the really essential parts the author assumes the position of the critical theology. Yet Jordan emphasizes the view of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel as distinguishing his standpoint from that of modern theologians (pp. 99-100). But I am unable to understand how he can attribute so great importance to this point, in view of his statement on p. 21: "The Jesus of John's Gospel is, so to speak, thoroughly interpenetrated by the

found, spiritual and worthful treatise is Weinel's *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1907). A very direct and lively

entire personality of the author, and has taken over from him many a passage, many a manner of speaking, many a term of expression, many a thought; John has viewed Jesus through his own eyes alone, while the first three evangelists have, more nearly than he, approached an objective historical presentation." I am inclined to think that Wrede's *Messiasgeheimnis* (Göttingen, 1901), the fundamental position of which is, by most critical theologians rejected as untenable, is just as little to be regarded as invalidating the picture of Jesus presented by modern theology as the words of Albert Schweitzer† or the fanatical pronouncement of Schnehens (cf. Jordan's work, pp. 101, 103). And I must question the statement that modern theology leads along the road which "explains the entire person of Jesus by the factors of his environment, the earthly world" (p. 103). Finally, when Jordan (p. 104) reckons as "the wholly natural consequence" of the application of modern theology that "Jesus can not be the absolute guide to God, the absolute revealer of God," he seems to me to introduce obscurity and to employ a confusing misuse, in such a connection, of the word "absolute." By the test of the mind of Jesus himself, which is the more important and necessary—that in the realities of life Jesus serves as the highest and most determined guide to God, or that we honor him in theory and in terminology by applying to him the obscure predicate "absolute"?

†Translator's note: In *Von Reimarus zu Wrede; eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung,* Tübingen, 1906; Eng. transl., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: a Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede,* London, 1910.

review is furnished by Gustav Pfannmüller's attractive work *Jesus im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (Leipsic and Berlin, 1908), which in light touches portrays the characteristic pronouncements, sketches, poems, and pictures by the most diverse ages and men, giving to each characterization its orientation in a brief introduction. From this can one obtain a most lively impression of the varying and multiform ways in which in the course of time the person of Jesus has produced effects and been understood, also how in the present it raises a host of questions and confronts the modern man as a very palpable problem.

Was Jesus really the conscious founder of a new world religion, or merely the head of a Jewish sect which had no influence, the adherents of which unduly emphasized him and his cause or made of both something essentially different from what he himself thought and determined? Did he look for the realization of a transcendental and supernatural kingdom of the future, or was he conscious of founding in his time and in this world a spiritual kingdom of God? Was he a Jewish rabbi of no greater significance than many others, without originality or more

than ordinary power, or was he a religious genius, an ethical hero, unique among men in purity, and in warmth and spiritual power? Was he a man whose life, altogether against his initiative, developed from a beautiful idyl into a terrible tragedy, or was he a hero whose whole activity and whose suffering and death were the expression, by sheer intensity of purpose, of a lofty and most intimately purposeful personality? Was he a martyr to conviction, a hero and a revelation of eternal truth, or a poor deluded enthusiast, if not indeed an arrant deceiver? Was he a rebel, or the victim of a foul judicial murder? Was he normal physically and mentally, a sound natural man, or was he an eccentric, morbid individual affected by monomania and hallucination? Was he consciously or unconsciously an adherent and champion of a Buddhistic contempt for the world and of asceticism, or an independent historical phenomenon, having his own positive aims and the might of a new world-conqueror? Did he belong in the category of social reformers, of champions of the poor and down-trodden, or did he teach on the contrary a thoroughly individualistic view

and art of life? Was he, or was he not, a worker of miracles? Had he, or had he not, messianic ambitions? Had he, or had he not, a feeling for culture, for nature, for work, for civic association, for family life? Did he undergo during his public activity any inner development, or did he remain the same in purpose, views, and intentions? Was he the mediator and expiator for mankind, or only the religious-ethical leader, the head and the antitype of a new mankind? Was he the revealer of a rational religion and humanity, or the messenger of supernatural truth? Was he, in what he was and did, solely the product of the historical factors of his time and of significance only for the distant past, or is he in a certain sense the comprehension of human totality, the universal, ideal man? Does his unique significance apply only to the ethical-religious, or does it extend over all regions of life and history? Is he the appearance in history of a special divine power or person, or only a man, though the holiest and greatest among men? Have the honors attributed to him in the New Testament, the essential attributes applied to him in ecclesiastical dogma, any abiding cogency for

the present? Is Jesus himself an obsolete and dead bit from a foreign and distant past, or is there a sense in which one may confess "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."*

* It is permitted to mention but a few of the names with which questions like the foregoing are connected. Thus Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer regard the Kingdom of God, preached by Jesus, as belonging to the future; F. Naumann (in his *Jesus als Volksmann,* Göttingen, 1894) regards him as a social reformer; Joseph Viktor Widmann (*Der Heilige und die Tiere,* Frauenfeld, 1907) describes him as a martyr true to his convictions; Houston Stuart Chamberlain makes of him the Aryan ideal man with positive purposes in civilization, and the purveyor of a completed ethics (*Arische Weltanschauung,* Berlin, 1905); Oscar Wilde (*De profundis*) looks upon him as the noblest and first of the individualists, benevolent and imaginative; by Gustav Frenssen, Hans von Kahlberg, and in a certain sense also by Rosegger, Jesus is pictured as romantic and extravagant, vacillating between mental abstraction and action, conducted from idyl to tragedy; Max Kretzer calls him "the conscience of society" and a living protest against the Christianity of history; by Eduard von Hartmann, Ellen Key, Paul Heyse, Kalthoff, and Leo Tolstoy he is regarded as an ascetic idealist opposed to civilization; Sören Kierkegaard characterizes him as sheer man, albeit the greatest who ever lived, yet penetrated throughout by inner disharmony; Karl Gutzkow and Eugen Losinsky see in him a thoroughly mediocre and decadent individual, full of contradictions and follies; the anonymous author of *Finsternisse, die Lehre Jesu im Lichte der Kritik* (1896), and also Yves Guyot and Sigismund Lacroix, consider him as religiously and

Delicate and timid spirits who live in calm retirement and ecclesiastical quiet, undisturbed by the spiritual storms and turmoils of the present, are not unlikely to be terrified by these questions. Nevertheless such problems are actually proposed and discussed in public, and they are even more numerous and more penetrating than those already suggested. If we are to be just to the present and would serve our contemporaries, we may not act as if these questions were no concern of ours, nor may we hastily label as "irreligious" and "godless" those who ask them and, perchance, answer them in a manner that seems to us unlovely and incomprehensible. Jesus himself was not one to bind men to a mass of unintelligible formulas—that frank saying about "Lord, Lord!" was uttered with ringing emphasis. Indeed we are told that a man who came to him with doubts he pronounced "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile" [John i. 45-48]. If we are rightly to decide and really to con-

ethically an abject and doubtful subject. The interested reader who would gain in brief a knowledge of what has been said on the subject is referred to Pfanmüller's book named above (p. 10).

vince, we must first understand those who question and doubt.

Is it strange that the present age presents such a multitude of questions concerning the person of Jesus? Has there ever been a period in the world's history when in so brief a time so complete a revolution in the thought of culture and in mental life has been wrought as in the last century and a half? Are not these uneasy gropings and agitations, these searchings and essays after discovery, a consequence of the inconceivably great flood of new impressions and phenomena which have poured out over mankind? Are they not the other side, so to speak, of all the liberties and acquisitions of which we are so proud? Like the sea through a breach in a dyke, these new questions have invaded the hitherto so clearly delimited and restfully situated preserve of the domain of the spirit. Philosophy has experienced a very remarkable transformation, and theology has also changed essentially its character. The critical processes and the contemplation induced by the scientific discussion of nature—in practical results so rich—have undermined tradition and broken it down, and a totally

different set of preferences has set at work enormous activities.

With the literary difficulties which inhere in the earliest documents belonging to Christianity there are associated difficulties of conception which theological tradition has imposed, as well as religious difficulties inhering in the heritage from the past which have too easily gained acceptance. Comparative religion has rent the veil which had concealed so many related phenomena in the old religions. Graves and ruins, sherds and rubbish heaps have begun to tell the story of primitive times. And as the horizon of our knowledge extends and our methods become keener, we grow in equal measure more conscious of the limits of our understanding, the relativity of our wisdom, and the incompleteness of our conception of the universe. It is not always the passion for novelty or a fundamental opposition to piety and to Christianity which is responsible for criticism and for the reaction from the traditional; often enough the stimulus arises from an earnest striving for the truth or from a conviction respecting the right path.

It seems to me that consciously or uncon-

sciously the might of criticism and contradiction [of tradition] is threefold. (1) Ecclesiastical instruction in doctrine, so far as religious dogma is concerned, had for centuries the characteristics of public and official authority, a conception and a practice which is even yet more in evidence than is generally appreciated. Partisan attempts to break the force of this, periphrasis and allegorical minimizing, do not change the facts. And the historical spirit with its criticism is bringing this impropriety into sharper relief. The more authority was permitted in earlier days to pronounce decision, the more jealously and positively does the individual now guard his independence and liberty; he may even go as far as often to prefer the absurd and the miraculous to tradition. (2) It is also a fact that in spite of all the instruction given, the formulas of church teaching are not understood; the impression has gained currency that as consent to a formula prevails in the Church, submission to a train of thought counts as faith. Now, as a matter of fact, the so-called teaching of the Church, by which is meant the officially recognized body of church tradition, in all its parts and

as a whole has much more meaning and right than to the layman it appears to possess. But nevertheless this can be made intelligible only to one who has appropriated a considerable sum of historical and philosophical culture. And it must be conceded that the dogmatic teaching of the Church in the abbreviated form usually employed in popular education has no inner unity, on the contrary it betrays clearly the fact that it is a deposit of different ages. Religious formulas as formulas *per se* are objectionable; they are welcome and useful only so far as they convey to the immediate understanding not simple cognitions but religious values. (3) There is now abroad an involuntary feeling that it is contrary to sense and insufficient in effect to attempt to comprehend in a formula or a theorem the value of a personality. This is not merely because personality can be appreciated only by living personalities and may be variously comprehended according to disposition, need, maturity, and point of view; a further reason lies in the possession by each personality of something elastic, free, mysterious, something to which definite measure may not be applied. Every per-

sonality presents a problem; the larger and profounder the personality, the more unfathomable is the problem.

Hence it comes that difficulties multiply with respect to the person of Jesus. Nothing is to be said here of his existence before and after his earthly activity. A mist hangs over his birth, and obscurity over the years of his growth to manhood. As an object of historical investigation there is left only the period of his public service, from his baptism by John till his death. Of his form we have neither description nor picture. Hundreds of questions about his earthly existence are unanswered and unanswerable. His story was for years transmitted orally, and when it was committed to writing it was no longer completely harmonious and transparent. A "Life of Jesus" in the exact sense of the words is impossible, there is available only a sketch of his public ministry: from this there stand out with significance the traits which portray his character. And how wonderful is the result! This man, of whom we know so little and with whom none of us was acquainted, is yet known by us all and familiar to us all.

## II

Can it be that there was only a phantom, an autosuggestion, a deceptive shadow, a ghost, which deceived one generation after another, and that Jesus never existed? In the very recent past there have appeared certain scholars who, like Bruno Bauer fifty years ago, deny the existence of Jesus and attribute Christianity as a whole to a spiritual emotion of the masses or carry it back to sheer myth. This is done by such men as the Englishman John M. Robertson (*Christianity and Mythology,* London, 1900; *Short History of Christianity,* ib., 1901; *Pagan Christs; Studies in Comparative Hierology,* ib., 1903), the Frenchmen Émile Burnouf (*La Science des religions,* 4th ed., Paris, 1885) and Polydore Hochart (*Études d'histoire religieuse,* Paris, 1888), the American professor of mathematics William Benjamin Smith (*Der vorchristliche Jesus, nebst weiteren Vorstudien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums,* Giessen, 1906),

and in Germany the Bremen pastor A. Kalthoff (*Das Christus-Problem; Grundlinien zu einer Sozialtheologie,* Jena, 1903; *Die Entstenung des Christentums. Neue Beiträge zu Christusproblem,* ib., 1904), Karl Vollers of Jena (*Die Weltreligionen in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange,* Jena, 1907), the Marburg orientalist Peter Christian Albrecht Jensen (*Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur,* Strasburg, 1906), and finally Arthur Drews, the philosopher of Carlsruhe (*Die Christusmythe,* Jena, 1909). Obviously it is the duty of men professionally qualified to examine from the very foundation up the writings thus produced, and to scrutinize their methods, premises, and presumptive conclusions. The present lecture is to be confined to a single example. And since Jensen with his derivation of the Gospel from the Gilgamesh epic has taken appeal from the opposition of scientific professionals to a wider public in the *Frankfurter Zeitung,* (Feb. 19, 20, April 7, 1909) and in Gunkel's *Die Gemeinde,* (1909, no. 19) has experienced a quiet and real refutation, attention will be given to the work by Arthur Drews named above.

With great practical learning and plausibility this author seeks to prove the thesis that the Jesus of the Gospels as a man and the founder of the Christian religion never existed.* He asserts that for the last two centuries before the Christian era Jewish circles and sects (Therapeutæ, Essenes, Mandeans or Gnostics, and the Jewish apocalyptic writers are cited) had already been worshipping a Jesus; this was not a man of that name, however, but a deity belonging to a sun-cult, a deity of light, or of fire, of one taken from the powers of nature or of vegetation who was constantly alternating between death and resurrection. This Jesus, the early Ephraimitic sun-god Joshua, is declared to be more or less closely identical with the deities of the East-Asian or Indian religions, with Mithra, Adonis, Honover, Agni, and others. Bethlehem was named by the prophets as the birthplace of the Messiah not merely because it was the native place of David, but also because it was the location of an old sanctuary of Baal, especially of Adonis. The story of the flight into Egypt is the same myth as is found in

* See translator's appendix at end of lecture.

the tale of the flight of Leto and Apollo from the dragon Pytho, in the Egyptian story of Hathor, in the Assyrian narrative of Sargon, and in the Indian story of the flight of Krishna. The father of Jesus is said to be a carpenter because of the fact that in the early fire worship the deity is called into existence from the heart of pieces of wood which are rubbed together.* Other indications of fire worship are found in the words of John the Baptist that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Matt. iii. 11), as well as in those of Jesus concerning the fire which he had come to send and the baptism with which he was to be baptized (Luke xii. 49-50). In the transfiguration, according to analogies brought from Further Asia and India, Elijah and Moses signify the sun and the moon which pale before the savior deity. Many incidents in the life of Jesus are said to have their source in Buddhistic circles. The Lord's Supper is in form and meaning a reproduction of the primitive sacrificial meal in the

* Translator's Note:—The Hindoo deity, Agni, is said to be recreated each time fire is produced by the operation of the fire-drill. Cf. E. W. Hopkins, *Religions of India,* pp. 105-112, Boston, 1895.

fire cult of Agni, of the sacramental meal in the cult of Mithra, and attaches also to the early Hebrew placing of the shew bread and to the mythical narrative of the divine priest-king Melchizedek. Not a few particulars of the history of the passion are derived from the customs and usages, the processions and human sacrifice of the Roman Saturnalia, the Babylonian Sakka festival, the Jewish Purim celebration, and the Persian ritual of the procession of the beardless. Ethical and religious details have been contributed from Plato's description of the righteous man in his "Republic" and from the book of the Wisdom of Solomon. The cross is in no sense a symbol original with and peculiar to Christianity, but in primitive times a holy symbol used by Hebrews and gentiles having its connections with sun worship and being a sign of life and of fire, and only in late times and among the Christians did it come to signify the means of producing a martyr death. Similarly, the lamb as an emblem of the Messiah is, like so many other details, to be explained by means of Indian usage, having arisen from the ram of the Indian Agni, and *agnus Dei,* "lamb of God," was origin-

ally *Agni deus,* "the god Agni." The history of the suffering and death of Christ are a common possession of the religions of Further Asia; Christ, who was dead and arose again, is no other than Tammuz or Mithra or Attys or Melkarth or Adonis or the Cretan Zeus or the Egyptian Osiris. By the cults of those deities, in which a king or a priest or a criminal or a dummy figure was slain [or pretended to be slain] as a representative sufferer, is explained the passion of Christ. Isaiah's chapters concerning the suffering servant, compared with the offering for reconciliation, prove that the early Hebrews already had the conception of a human or divine scapegoat, while Psalm xxii. depicts fully and uniquely the suffering of such a man put to death at the observance of a festival.

According to the representation which is here detailed, all these items were taken by Paul, who was the real founder of the Christian religion and had no knowledge of a man Jesus, and were worked together around the name of the divine being Jesus Christ into a cosmological redemptive religion, the ethical side of which depended essentially upon the

Hebrew books of piety and wisdom, the representations of Seneca and the Stoa, and, in part, Buddhistic traditions. Motives which had their root in propaganda and in practical and political considerations subsequently led to emphasis upon the manhood of Jesus and the exposition of this idea in the so-called "historical Jesus." The Gospels, the Synoptic as well as the Johannean, are in no wise sources for history, but are merely the legendary deposit of the faith of later Christian communities; they can not prove the existence of the human founder of a religion named Jesus, of whom the secular history of the period knows nothing at all. Drews sums up his personal views of a real Christianity in the words: "The life of the world as the life of God; the painful development of humanity as the history of the divine passion; the process of world-development as that of a deity who suffers, contends, and dies in each single creation in order to overcome the barriers of finiteness in the religious consciousness of men and to show the way therein to a triumph over the entire world-sorrow—that is the truth of the Christian doctrine of redemption" (p. 188). In his preface

Drews discovers the trend of his book when he gives utterance to the following dogmatic axiom: "While a 'historic Jesus' is regarded as a 'unique' religious personality and the indispensable mediator of faith, the hope of a 'further development' and a deepening of the modern religious view of the universe is not to be fulfilled. Under the control of a 'book religion,' as Christianity is, no unprejudiced science, no free development of thought, no real culture in the sense of a conformity of the thinking process to life is possible" (p. xi.).

This volume I took up with anticipation and at first read it with emotion. But the further I advanced in it and the more frequently I read it, the calmer I became; I had the sensation of having visited an exhibition for the display of pieces of art of a mythological and religious-historical character. It is in no sense my purpose to waive aside an examination and a synthesis of Christianity based upon a comparative history of religion, provided only it be undertaken in a sober, thorough, and circumspect manner. The present is most busy with the problem of comparative religion. Impossible seems to

me denial of the fact that both the Hebrew and the early Christian materials, in certain parts and incidents (notably in those parts which formerly furnished insurmountable barriers to exposition), show traces of the influence of Babylonian, Persian, and other ideas of like character. Examples of such passages are to be found in Ezekiel, Daniel, the historical books of the Old Testament, and the Revelation of John. But the undertaking which Drews has taken in hand, namely, to explain the totality of Christianity by means of syncretistic cosmological myths, meanwhile ruling its founder out of court, is shattered as soon as it is begun, for the single reason that it attributes incredibility to history, reason, and religion. By means of inconceivable infilterings of ideas, usages, and myths from India and heathen Farther Asia, it is asserted, in the dark stalactitic caves of secret doctrine belonging to Jewish sects there took form first the figure of Jesus as a deity and the object of a cult, and after that the Jesus of the Evangelists with all the concrete details which gather around him! And then, this stalactitic formation has been for two thousand years regarded as a living

historic personality—but only—as Drews hints—by obscurantists and simpletons!

It is a very old custom in the exposition of religious history to regard the gods either as apotheosized men or as personified forces of nature or of ethics. But sometimes neither explanation will fit the case. There have been cases where saga and legend, fitting in well with some idea or symbol or usage, have brought a personality to birth; but such cases generally have to do with a dim and distant past. Examples of this sort of thing are the legend of St. Ursula and her 11,000 maidens, and that of the popess Joan, which Döllinger's keenness tracked out (J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters,* Munich, 1863; Eng. transl., *Fables respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages,* London, 1871, New York, 1872). Sometimes the attempt is made to deny the existence of historical persons, but this is only a fashion, a sensational exploit. Within the memory of the living, indeed only thirty years since, to Shakespeare was denied the authorship of his works. One is tempted to wonder why the opportunity was not seized at the jubilee of Paul Gerhardt to show that the historical Gerhardt

and the poet of the *Lieder* were two entirely different persons—something that would be comparatively easy. Such *tours de force* arouse attention for a short time, but they soon fall into the oblivion which they merit.

There is another parallel both fruitful and doubly instructive; it deals with the results of a broadened horizon, and it also is concerned with a purely neutral subject which in itself does not affect the conception of the universe. This is the question of the origin of German folk stories (A. Thimme, *Das Märchen,* Leipsic, 1909). The brothers Grimm, Johann Ludwig Uhland, and many others regarded our tales as a primitive German possession, to be employed as a significant source from which to learn about early German mental life and belief in the gods. But in 1859, under the influence of belief of a broad interracial relationship as possessed by the German stories, Benfey proclaimed his theory that these tales all had their origin in India, and had been diffused abroad, first finding entrance to Europe in the eleventh century; so that the German "Märchen" were neither ancient nor native, neither holy nor popular in their sources.

As a consequence of this theory, the value of the many sagas concerning the deities and the heroes seemed to be lost so far as it pertained to German history. Benfey's theory lasted a few years, until under the force of facts old and new it was broken down and gave place to the treatment of Bastian, in which the psychology of peoples was the determining factor. Hardly two decades have passed since it was the fashion to seek in practically all these tales a nature myth—e. g., in the tale of the Sleeping Beauty there was discerned either the myth of Gerd* or a myth of the seasons (cf. Linnig, *Deutsche Mythen-Märchen,* No. 16, Paderborn, 1883; and B. Saubert, *Germanische Welt- und Gottanschauung,* Hanover, 1895). But the more numerous the attempts by the contribution

* Translator's Note:—Gerd was, in northern mythology, the beautiful daughter of the giant Gymir. Once she went out of her father's dwelling, and air and sea became radiant with her beauty. Freyr saw her and became sick with love. He sent his servant Skirnir, mounted on the steed which could leap the flames that encircled and guarded her father's castle, to woo her with the aid of eleven golden apples, and the wonderful ring, Draupnir. But the maiden was won only through powerful magic formulas, and was for nine nights the consort of Freyr.

of such material to clear up the confusion, the more involved this confusion became (cf. Thimme, *Das Märchen,* pp. 99 sqq.). As a consequence students in this department have become very cautious in treading upon "the smooth and slippery floor of explanation of myths" (Weinhold, *Einleitung zu Loki*). The experiences of those who have labored in this department of scientific investigation ought to serve as a lesson and a warning to those whose field is the history of religion.

Drews has collected an incredibly large and confusing amount of detail from the history of religions and weaves it in and out in variegated patterns. Throughout he discovers similarities and infers from these connection or even dependence. Of course this must and will come under the test of professional and scientific examination. But the veriest layman can not avoid seeing in many places how external and superficial, how arbitrary and unsatisfactory, how labored are the points of comparison which are submitted. Indeed, where Drews often detects a similarity or a suspected likeness, a sound eye will in many cases perceive a much greater

difference or even direct opposition. But though the similarities be granted, out of a hundred possibilities is there a single probability or a single certainty? Still further, Drews arrays supposition with a half proved or unproved remark, puts one hypothesis that is not thoroughly recognized but fits his needs upon another, and then deals with the whole as "facts." His exposition would have altogether a different value if he had adduced real facts and compelling reasons in the numerous passages in which he employs such turns of expression as "the presumption arises," "it may be taken as certain," "it seems," "the conclusion follows," "we know," "we have reason to assume," "there is no doubt," or where he strengthens his remarks with the overworked "evidently."* With this corresponds the method of Drews in dealing with literature and sources. That in general he attempts in the preface (cf. pp. ix., x., and elsewhere) to render the theologians harmless once for all, and that he questions our honesty and candor, I here simply record.

* Exceedingly characteristic from this point of view are pages 23-25, where, in crucial cases, Drews carries on the entire argument in this way.

But this does not prevent him from citing them when it suits his purpose; he uses the liberal theologians at times where they have advanced hazardous hypotheses and opinions, although his general attitude toward them is that of censorious scorn and ridicule; he adduces uncritically the Church Fathers where he chooses, but where they do not fit into his purpose he ignores them; he employs the orthodox theologians when he needs to do away with the liberals. He most delights in citing with the emphasis of assured scientific finality those who agree with his radical position—such men as Robertson, Burnouf, Hochart, Smith, and the "good, honest" Kalthoff (see above, p. 13)—and alongside of these in critical passages he uses orthodox worthies who, however, are not in general regarded as authorities, as, for example, Epiphanius and Grützmacher (cf. pp. 23, 155).

In his haste this professor of philosophy, Dr. Drews, has allowed some things to pass which in noteworthy manner he has not correctly or logically apprehended. Thus on p. 23 he writes: "the place Nazareth was first invented as an afterthought in order to ex-

plain in unobtrusive manner the expression 'Jesus the Nazarene,' and also to bring it into agreement with the Gospels." But one at once asks: how can this be? Either the Evangelists invented this place (or knew of it) in which case it did not need to be invented as an afterthought; or it was later invented, in which case the Evangelists could not have alluded to it. Drews' statement is so self-contradictory that it is more difficult to put faith in it than in the hypothesis that Nazareth actually existed and that only by mere accident mention of it does not occur in literature earlier than the Gospels. In another passage, Drews seeks to prove that the cross was among the primitive Hebrews employed as a sacred symbol. To accomplish this he remarks that "according to some persons" it was the sign which the Israelites made on the doors at the exodus from Egypt, and that Moses' figure presented it during the fight with the Amalekites, while Isaiah, and Ezekiel, also mentioned it in certain passages (p. 76). Without further ado he proceeds to assume this as a matter of fact thus: "We have met the cross already in the Old Testament, where it serves as a mark of recognition and a means

of distinguishing the pious Israelites from the heathens, as well as a magical symbol" (pp. 20-21). As a matter of fact there is in the Old Testament itself in the passages adduced not a syllable that suggests the cross, and it was late Fathers of the Church who read the cross into these passages! Whether Drews was conscious of this, or whether he knew it and purposely kept silent concerning it, his method is in any case unscientific and frivolous. A third offence against logic, of singular character, is found in one of the most important sections, namely that in which the author seeks to prove that in pre-Christian times the cultus of a deity "Jesus" existed (pp. 23 sqq.). The proof of this is a shining example of the method. Drews is not able to show with the help of Epiphanius that the Therapeutæ or Essenes had a Jesus who was the object of worship as deity, but he naïvely continues: "After Jesus, *or after his ancestor Jesse,* they named themselves Jesseites (*Jessäer*)." The addition of the clause "or after his ancestor Jesse" is very significant; it does away entirely with the conclusiveness of the sentence, for if there is present only the possibility that the "Jessäer" named themselves after Jesse and not

from Jesus, their name is no longer a proof of the existence of Jesus as the object of worship in pre-Christian times, and with this go all the consequences which Drews infers respecting the deity of the Nazarene. Moreover, did Jesus as a deity and the object of cultic worship have an ancestor?* It is further to be noted that Drews is unable to show the existence within the circle of Jewish apocalyptic writing of the name Jesus; he therefore has recourse to the secret teaching which he assumes contained it (p. 20). But what a pity it is that we know absolutely nothing of this secret teaching! And still further, the hero Joshua, especially if he is to be regarded as an early Ephraimitic sun deity, is looked upon neither in the Old Testament nor by pre-Christian Israelites as a divine being named Jesus. The assertion that in the book of the prophet Zechariah behind the personality of the high priest Joshua there appears such a divine being "in messianic illumination" is very pretty, but is in fact only idle fancy (pp. 21, 170).

* On p. 23 Drews remarks that the "Jessäer" "knew nothing of Christ, that is, of a man of that name." But the clause "that is, of a man of that name" is an arbitrary addition and is not at all justified.

Finally, that the Gnostic-Naassene hymn is pre-Christian has yet to be proved.*

Thus there is a complete breakdown of the means by which Drews seeks to prove the central point of his theory, namely, the existence of Jesus as the object of worship among pre-Christian Jewish sects, and this comes about by the combined force of fact and logic. With this also the finely constructed fabric by which this author seeks to illustrate the origin of Christianity loses its substantiality and it is altogether apart from the enormous intrinsic improbabilities which it presents to thinking men. Notwithstanding the artistic manner after which Drews, like the fabled veteran soldier who accompanied Peter on his journeys, places together the different members of his finely fabricated mannikin, the bones still lack heart and life.

* All investigators have so far regarded this hymn as post-Christian. The Naassenes appeal to a tradition which James, the brother of Jesus, is said to have passed on to Mariamne; they speak of the twelve apostles and make diligent use of the Fourth Gospel, which Drews dates after 140 A.D. Cf. Hippolytus, *Philosophumena,* V. v.-vii. (Eng. transl., in *Ante-Nicene Fathers,* v. 58-59, Buffalo, 1888).

When one returns from Drews' book to the writings of the New Testament, he has the sensation of waking up from confused and distracted dreams to the reality of life; he seems to be placed not before cloud pictures, but before real significant men. The engaging simplicity and naturalness of form, the penetratingly spiritual content of the narrative, the collection in completely clear and historical relations, the presence of an entire series of uninventable and highly concrete details, the whole eschatological temper, and, above all, the uniform and original ethical-religious tone, lift the narrative significantly above the character possessed by myths and mythological religions. The principal Pauline letters, the genuineness of which is conceded by Drews, are in time so close to the days of Jesus that mythological explanation is excluded. It may well be that Paul personally never saw the historical Jesus; but that he on that account knew nothing about Jesus is pure assertion. Why does Paul, like most New Testament writers, often alternate in a manner altogether characteristic between the use of "Christ" or "Jesus Christ" (used when he is dealing with the dignity of Jesus)

and of the simple form "Jesus" (employed when the matter under discussion is Christ's historic work on earth)? And why did not the Jews hate and persecute the Essenes and Therapeutæ and Mandeans if these really anticipated Christianity? Indeed, one may ask why Paul himself persecuted the Christian communities and why he was himself later persecuted? Has not Paul in certain passages (e. g., at the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans and in the celebrated parallel between Adam and Jesus, Rom. v., 15; I Cor. xv. 22, 45) testified unmistakably to the humanity of Jesus? Did he not have dealings with James the brother of the Lord, and did he not know of other brothers who as married missionaries preached the Gospel (Gal. i. 19; I Cor. ix. 5)? Since when has the deity who is the object of a cultic worship had human brethren?*

* In Rom. i. 3 Paul says plainly that Jesus Christ "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh" (i.e., as a man he was a descendant of David). Drews' interpretation of this passage (p. 104) is void of meaning and linguistically impossible. In Rom. v., especially verse 17, Paul draws a parallel between the man Adam and the man Jesus Christ. In Gal. i., 19, cf. ii., 9, "James, the Lord's brother," is to be understood naturally as "brother by birth," and not in the wider sense

Drews lays considerable stress upon the fact that in the secular literature of the first century there is practically no mention of Jesus. This point must be conceded. But Drews employs neither secure logic nor a method free from special pleading when he attempts to draw, here as elsewhere, stringent inferences from the argument from silence.* No other than Voltaire, who surely in this case is above suspicion as a witness, has weighed this difficulty in all its particulars and has gone on record thus: "Shall the conclusion be drawn from this that there never was a Jesus? Not at all; since men after his death wrote both attacking and defending him, it is clear that he once lived.

of an adherent, as Drews would have it, having in mind Jerome, who in behalf of his pet dogma, respecting the perpetual virginity of Mary, would naturally not grant that Jesus had brethren after the flesh. But proof is furnished by I Cor., ix., 5, where "the brethren of the Lord" are mentioned as a special group beside the apostles and Cephas, showing that Paul had exact knowledge of several brothers of Jesus, also that he recognized the humanity of Jesus.

* Cf. the remark of Usener in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* i. 9: "It would be a childish assumption to hold as non-existent what we do not know." The short references by Suetonius, Tacitus, and Pliny are not contestible, as Drews remarks.

But it is no less evident that he lived so retired a life among men that none of the noteworthy have made mention of his person" (in his *Dieu et l'homme*). And Rousseau has written: "Are we then to dispose of the Gospel history as an arbitrary bit of poetizing? My friend, it is not possible so to poetize; and the incidents from the life of Socrates, which no one doubts, are less fully certified than the facts which concern Jesus Christ" (in his *Émile, ou de l'éducation,* 4 vols., Amsterdam, 1762, and often elsewhere; taken from the "confession of a vicar of Savoy"). Passing by the dicta of modern philosophers like Lotze, Wundt, Paulsen, and Eucken, who hold decisively to the historicity of Jesus, I cite in addition only the pronouncement of the Positivist John Stuart Mill, who in his posthumous *Three Essays on Religion . . . Theism* (London, 1874) has spoken somewhat like this: "Who among his disciples or their converts had the ability to conceive the words attributed to Jesus or to invent a life or construct a personality like that which confronts us in the Gospels? Surely not the fishermen of Galilee, and just

as little Paul, and least of all the earliest (post-apostloic) Christian writers."

It remains now to show by a series of examples how arbitrarily, inexactly, and wantonly Drews has used his materials. I pass without further notice the remarkable affirmation that the Peter of the Gospels is the result of a myth and, like Jesus, is identical with the deity Mithra, at the same time he is the same as Proteus and Janus.* But it is difficult to see how Drews, who is acquainted with the missionary capabilities of Buddhism, can permit himself to propose as an axiom without further justification the saying that a propaganda is not an accompaniment of an ascetic religion. And just as difficult is it to understand how, in view of the parable of the good Samaritan, he can affirm that the concept of "neighbor" is in the New Testament confined to the meaning of "a member of the brotherhood of Jesus" and that "only

* Cf. pp. 168-175. How far the unruly imagination of Drews carries him may be illustrated here by the fact that, in order to make the identification of Peter with Proteus, he combines the designation of Peter, John and James in Gal. ii., 9, as "pillars" (of the Christian community) with the "pillars of Proteus," which in the East correspond to "the pillars of Atlas" in the West. And this pretends to be science!

much later was it transformed into the larger humane sense which it bears in the present" (pp. 137, 161). An affirmation made by Drews is that in the Wisdom of Solomon (xvi. 28) it is recommended that at the break of day one pray to the rising sun (p. 66). He is challenged to make proof of this. He declares that John the Baptist baptized "in the name of" the Messiah that was expected and so handed on down to his adherents the magical operation which, according to the belief of the secret sects proceeds from the name of the redeemer (p. 25). A challenge of the proof of this is in place here also. For the support of his theory that in the New Testament the cross serves as a magical symbol Drews appeals (p. 81) to six passages in the Book of Revelation, one in the Epistle to the Galatians, and one in that to the Ephesians, where mention is made of a seal or of sealing (Rev. iii. 12, vii. 3 sqq., ix. 4, xiv. 1, xx. 4, xxii. 4; Gal. vi. 17; Eph. i. 13). Drews may with perfect impunity be challenged to show that in these passages there is any references whatever to the cross. In order to obtain a basis for showing a parallelism between Janus and Jesus, our

author affirms (p. 173) that Jesus in the Fourth Gospel calls himself a "keeper of the door." We would like to have the passage pointed out in which this occurs. Another declaration of Drews is the following (p. 49): "As the significance of Jesus was foretold by Simeon, who lamented because to him it was not granted to live to witness the wonderful deeds which the Savior was to perform, so in the Buddhistic legend the seer Asita perceived in spirit the greatness of the child and broke forth in lamentation because he was not to see the Perfect One in his lordship and could have no part in the work of salvation which he was to accomplish." Again the challenge may issue to point out the passage in the Gospel in which it is reported that Simeon lamented at all, and also that his lament had this basis. Once more, the assertion of the following (p. 100) is made on the ground that Antioch, Cyprus, and Cyrene are given in the Acts of the Apostles a special significance in the first missionary operations of Christianity, combined with the fact that these places were distinguished for assiduous practice of the cult of Adonis: "The Gospel was conse-

quently in its original form nothing but a Judaized worship of Adonis. The earliest missionaries of whom we hear did not attack the faith of the Syrian heathen, they simply affirmed that Christ the Messiah, the object of worship of the Jewish sects, was Adonis: Christ is the Lord."[1] A final challenge may here be given for the production of proof of the foregoing assertion.[2]

[1] Translator's Note:—Of course, the half truth which probably Drews has in mind is that Adonis is the Greek form of the Semitic word *Adon,* Hebrew *Adonai,* found often in the Old Testament, and there translated "Lord." That the Greek Adonis is not native to that people is one of the assured discoveries of modern times; this deity can, with certainty, be traced back to the Babylonian Tammuz, one of whose titles, *Adon,* the equivalent of the Old Testament form just cited, passed over into the Greek world as the proper name of the adopted deity.

[2] Drews is under the necessity also of showing how, out of the sensual and lascivious cult of Adonis developed the Christian religion so exacting in the matter of ethics. A few more examples of Drews' argumentation may be furnished here. The "Son of Man" of Dan. vii., 13, is (p. 9) interpreted as a "superearthly being representing the Godhead," notwithstanding the fact that the original significance of the phrase is "the people of Israel," as is shown by Dan. vii., 27. Zech. xii., 10, according to our author, is concerned with a deity, for whom lamentation arises; but this interpretation cannot stand, and the passage is better explained in an entirely different manner in accordance with II

For our purpose it is sufficient to set the structure built up by this investigator in a critical light and to disclose the pretended method of proof. "If thou hadst but kept silence, thou wouldst still have been a philosopher." Although it was repugnant to me to use up valuable time with such discussions, the nature of the case appeared to make it necessary. To put the matter in another way: if Drews permits himself to take such

Chron. xxxv., 24-25. Again, without giving the grounds for his construction, Drews connects the vicarious suffering of the Servant of Yahweh (Isa. liii.) with the scapegoat. He seems not to be aware that in the Hebrew celebration of the atoning sacrifice the scapegoat, upon which the sins of the people are laid, is not sacrificed, but is driven away into the wilderness. Moreover, in exegesis by the Jews of pre-Christian times, the suffering servant of Isaiah liii. was not identified with the Messiah. Similarly, the entire interpretation which is placed upon the twenty-second Psalm must be pronounced thoroughly arbitrary. Entirely untenable, also, is what is said of Isaiah lx. on p. 42. When Drews adduces as the source of the origin of the history of Jesus' passion, the feast of Purim, and the procession of the beardless, he is under the obligation—altogether apart from other improbabilities—of making clear why the parts in the action are assigned in contradictory fashion, as his exposition would lead one to expect. In connecting Luke xii., 49-50, with the worship of fire (pp. 57-58) our guide overlooks the fact that Jesus sends the fire (i.e., he is active), but that he is baptized with the baptism (i.e., he is passive); when

liberties in matters connected with the Bible which is accessible to all, what liberties will he not take when he is dealing with the more recondite sources which have to do with Gnosticism and with the history of other religions? For it is to be remembered that in these latter cases the language is often extremely difficult, the expression obscure, the text uncertain and mutilated, the dating pre-

this is observed, the entire comparison fails. On p. 39 there occurs a mistranslation of Isaiah vii., 15: it should read not "that he may know," but "until he know," and the resulting meaning is altogether different from what Drews would assume it to be. Again, on p. 65 is an arbitrary affirmation to the effect that in Heb. vii., 3, Melchisedec is significantly described as an old deity. But the epithets which there are applied to Melchisedec are fully explained by the character of the tradition concerning his personality. It is also affirmed (p. 66) that Christians adopted the celebration of Sunday, deriving it from heathen ceremonial. The author does not appear to know that the earliest passages in which Sunday is mentioned as a day of especial importance for Christians do not use the expression "day of the sun," but designate the day as "the day after the Sabbath," or as "the day of the Lord." On p. 158 Drews speaks of a yearly ecclesiastical contribution of Jewish Christians in behalf of Jerusalem, and compares with this the contributions collected by the Apostle Paul,—a comparison which is remarkable enough. To these examples of the method of Drews many others might be added, but the foregoing must suffice.

carious, the tradition variant, and the meaning ambiguous. If then I have been able in so brief a time and without a larger meausre of learning to show in the work of Drews a superfluity of inaccuracies and errors, what will be the verdict of the scholars learned in the technical departments, who are in a position to follow his propositions step by step? There is much better work for us to do than to engage in a scuffle with such opponents, with fanatics whose hypotheses have in their own eyes become dogmas.

## III

Accordingly there remains to us on firm grounds the personal Jesus as a historical reality, and also as a problem—a problem which is imperative. To the comprehension and solution of this problem we have the privilege of making some contribution. But just here it may be that we shall hear some one say: Why do you not remain in the paths which were opened by the Christian Church hundreds of years ago and have ever since been traveled by it? Why do you not speak of the divine and the human nature

of Jesus, of his twofold state in his exaltation and his humiliation, of his threefold office as prophet, priest, and king, of his nature as Son of man and Son of God, of his significance as a sacrifice, and the like? There is no internal necessity, considering the matter in itself, why we may not do this. In that case we should advance a section out of Biblical theology, something from the history of dogma, and selections from systematic theology and ethics, we would seek to make intelligible the Biblical series of thought and the development of ecclesiastical dogma, and square ourselves with orthodoxy. But with full realizations of what we are doing and for reasons that are weighty we this time decline to take this well-known way. For we have the impression that these tracks are far too well trodden and these series of ideas and conceptions are too thumb-marked to be effective in making the modern man regard them as worthy of real consideration. If the screw is too often used and turned in its socket, it becomes loose and ceases to grip. Similarly, for one kind of people the dogmatic pictures and conceptions, so often repeated and officially advocated, have be-

come tiresome and for that very reason are from the outset worthless and unfruitful. For another kind of people, those who advocate and press these ideas, the danger is immediate that they will not be profoundly affected by these familiar thoughts, that on the contrary they will in dangerous fashion fall into the quiet of stagnation; where they merely listen to formulas they make themselves contented and regard the problem not only as solved but as rightly solved. We on the other hand are fully convinced that, in a sense, Jesus is not at all comprehended through a theoretical recognition of those ecclesiastical trains of ideas, and still further, that such trains of ideas are neither suitable nor absolutely necessary in order to make clear the significance of Jesus. The essential is the thing itself, not the means of exposition.

In fact, we mean to say that those ecclesiastical dogmas and those Biblical representations are in no way so simple and immediately intelligible as people are accustomed to assume. Those representations, concepts, and series of ideas were all given out and related to the person of Jesus at cer-

tain definite periods and at those times their application was timely, natural, and illuminant. At a time when people knew of priests and sacrifice as something within their own immediate experience, these representations afforded an adequate means of comprehending the significance of Jesus. When men's thinking ran in the categories of Platonic thought, there developed the doctrine of the two natures of Christ. When the deification of the human race was regarded as the aim of salvation, the doctrine was formulated that in Christ human nature and divine had become one. When the German system of law was a living force, Anselm endeavored by means of that system to make the divine humanity of Christ understandable. Similarly, in every age what Christ is and what he stands for must be brought home to the intelligence by means of the trains of thought and the conceptions which seem to be the simplest, most natural, and most significant TO THAT AGE. It is in this way that the understanding of the Gospel fits itself into the universal consciousness. On the other hand, it is a matter of continually renewed experience and observation that cer-

tain representations, concepts, and trains of thought have proved illuminating and conclusive to the intelligence of an earlier time, but to a later period, the genius of which was different, these same representations, etc., furnished only difficulties and hindrances. Every such representation is in the last analysis inadequate, a feeble and transitory form for an inexhaustible content. The consequence is that such thought-series, belonging to a past that is foreign, requires as a prerequisite explanation, interpretation, translation, and application or adaptation. The earliest Christians attempted to convey to their contemporaries in a way that should be immediately comprehended the value of the person and work of Jesus, which was to themselves an immediate and lively intuition; they therefore represented him as the true high priest, as the completely efficacious, unique, and well-pleasing sacrifice. The men of that time had immediate knowledge of the significance of priest and sacrifice (and that method of setting Jesus forth had meaning). But for us it is necessary to expound laboriously to youth and congregation what it was to be priest, sacrifice, prophet,

and the like, and in the process we are hemmed in by all sorts of difficulties; only after having accomplished all this can we begin to apply those conceptions to Jesus with the prospect of conveying at least something of what was intended to be conveyed by the expressions used. The evil of it is that out of these figures and conceptions dogmas have been created as though their application to the person of Jesus was unavoidable for purposes of redemption and in themselves conduced to a right apprehension of the facts. This is an exceedingly dangerous error. For to me the significance of Jesus first becomes really clear when I have connected it with my own peculiar, firmly fixed, immediate conceptions of value and am able to express it (in such terms); and this was the condition of things in primitive Christianity.

It is worth while to consider how many and how various are the meanings which are conveyed by the conceptions applied to Jesus, how subject to controversy and how ambiguous are the series of ideas employed. One may realize for himself how the teaching of the Church simply puts together and adds up the incongruent doctrinal constructions of

various periods, and in doing this has not asked a single question respecting the inner unity and compatibility of the constituent parts. From the individual doctrines may be gained a worthy meaning; but in their aggregate they present difficult riddles and offer an unclear, composite, and lifeless picture which resembles an old mosaic which has been often patched up or restored. Experience of this fact is often repeated in the processes of instruction and preaching, in apologetics and in missionary work; the ready-made dogma gives no assistance, for the introduction to the intelligence calls always for the use of means which are the simplest, the most natural, and the most applicable to the circumstances.

In what way, then, shall we go about the task of bringing to men of today a realization of the significance of Jesus? It is possible to apply the method of chemical analysis, setting forth the person and teaching of Jesus in all its components as they are discovered—indicating what is Platonic, what is Stoic, what is rabbinic, apocalyptic, ascetic, mystical, Buddhistic, and so on. Such an undertaking might be valuable, but it would be

uncertain and might easily lead astray. The person of Jesus is not an example in arithmetic, nor is it an object of natural history; the analysis of it would therefore give no clear exposition. Or one might set Jesus in certain categories which are definite and regarded as important by the modern consciousness, and seek by comparison to gain an evaluation—might attempt to make him understood as a theologian, or teacher, or speaker, or founder of a religion. By this process surely many points of view worthful in themselves would be gained; but there would inevitably appear to the consciousness more of what Jesus was not or did not accomplish. He was neither prince, nor political economist, nor builder of roads, and just as little was he theologian or professor of a revealed philosophy. The method which comes closest is an exposition along lines ethical and religious, the first concern of which is with his real manhood, and then considers how far in Jesus there is given and guaranteed the truly good. Or shall we choose the most exalted expressions of language as a vehicle by which to make Jesus understood? As a rule these are obscure and

express far less than they seem to say. Shall we then speak of him as critically as we can? That would be more circumspect, but in itself is insufficient. A purely speculative treatment forgets often the serious reality, while a purely historical investigation does not do justice to religious power. One may express the being and value of Jesus in intellectual or esthetic terms; but all purely theoretical or artificial treatment of the problem will remain one-sided and incomplete.

In order to discover the correct way we must combine religious warmth with scientific soberness. We come to the task with the knowledge that comprehension of a personality, especially of a personality like that of Jesus, cannot be exhausted, that as a matter of fact it may exhibit very varied grades, according to the situation in life and the spiritual maturity of the individual. On the other hand, we must emphasize the reality that in order to obtain the valuation of a personality, it is not necessary to secure a documentary and all-embracing knowledge of the entire life. How often de we bestow our interest and our confidence, even our love, upon those of whom only a few very limited acts

and words are known to us! We are contented therefore to indicate the direction and the definite particulars by means of which one may form an independent judgment of Jesus. We shall consider him first as teacher, next as personality, and finally as force.

These three words—teacher, personality, force—correspond to the historical fact and to the aim of Jesus himself. As a peripatetic teacher Jesus exercised his activity, he was self-consciously a personality of entirely unique character and as such has become known to others, while an immeasurable spiritual power has continued to stream forth from him even until the present. And these three conceptions correspond exactly to modern methods of thinking, particularly where the object is to understand and to estimate the value of a man. On the one side they are limited historically and scientifically, on the other side they are defined with reference to ethics and religion. Each of these conceptions is in itself clear while it yet encloses the most momentous problems, is limited and yet inexhaustible, is easily understood and yet incalculably profound, is undivided and concentrated and none the less

capable of the most diversified content. If our purpose carries through, we shall come to a living understanding of Jesus as teacher, personality, force. But be it said here—our path leads away from theoretical consideration of the subject to practical experience. The value of teaching can be authenticated only through effective, patient action; the value of personality, only through personal devotion; the value of force, only through practical experiment. If Jesus is to be for us not a circumstance occasioning stumbling but a fruitful experience, he must become a problem not for the head alone but also for heart and life. Here, as everywhere in the natural and spiritual life, it will be found true that if there be present only a germ of being, having really the power of life and understanding, and if that germ be carefully fostered and patiently cherished, life and understanding will grow of itself. From doubts and problems there well emerge a religious certainty that will prove settled, forceful, and victorious.

## TRANSLATOR'S APPENDIX

The book by Drews, together with his defence of his conclusions by lectures and in current periodicals, has caused a very considerable commotion throughout Protestant Germany and Switzerland. In the neighborhood of Berlin alone about fifty-five popular meetings have been held to protest against both the matter and the spirit of his presentation. In part these meetings have been directed also against "liberal theology" (for which the authors of these lectures stand), although it is noted in answer that the "liberal theologians" are almost to a man the opponents of Drews. The literary side of the battle is noteworthy, for a flood of works and articles is issuing from the press (recalling the "Babel und Bibel" controversy of 1902-03), of which those under the following titles are noteworthy:

A. Drews, *Die Petruslegende,* Frankfort, 1910; D. Chwolson, *Ueber die Frage, ob*

*Jesus gelebt hat,* Leipsic, 1910; P. Jensen, *Hat der Jesus der Evangelien wirklich gelebt?* Frankfort, 1910; idem, *Moses, Jesus, Paulus. Drei Sagenvarienten des babylonischen Gottmenschen Gilgamesch,* ib., 1910; M. Maurenbrecher, *Von Nazareth nach Golgotha,* Berlin, 1909; G. Pfannmüller, in *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland,* May 28, 1910, cols. 705-708; H. Weinel, *Ist das "liberale" Jesusbild widerlegt?* Tübingen, 1910; J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte,* Tübingen, 1910; H. Windisch, in *Christliche Welt,* 1909, and in *Theologische Rundschau,* May, 1910; pp. 163-182; H. Zimmern, *Zum Streit um die "Christusmythe." Das babylonische Material in seinen Hauptpunkten dargestellt,* Berlin, 1910; A. Böhtlingk, *Zur Aufhellung der Christus mythologie,* Frankfort, 1910; W. von Schnehen, *Der moderne Jesuskultus,* ib., 1910; P. Rohrbach, *Geboren von der Jungfrau,* ib., 1910.

# Jesus As Teacher

BY

PASTOR W. VEIT

## II

## JESUS AS TEACHER

It is our task to deal with Jesus as teacher, that is to say, to consider how he employed the word. Particular attention is for a very brief space asked to the fact that Jesus used the word as the instrument by means of which to exercise his religious influence upon men. This appears to be, at first sight, a matter of course. Nevertheless, that which appears so self-evident, namely that religion should be stimulated by the word and through it produced, was absolutely not the original order of things. Under primitive conditions, religion employed entirely different means to disclose itself to men. It worked through sacred offices, cultic ceremonies, slaughtered rams and oxen, the sweet odor of incense, priestly garments of variegated pattern, drums, trumpets, flutes, and harps. And this method of working and of existing was not confined to its beginnings; religions are ever longing to return

to these beginnings, they display a natural tendency ever to become again cultus, sacrament, priesthood, church. As a consequence, those men who would extend religion through the word, meanwhile passing these other means by, are going against the normal movement of religions; they accomplish an ethical action in swimming contrary to the stream of development. To this class belongs Jesus, and so his activities will be understood through the word. He is one of those remarkable men who, when religion is under discussion, do not picture to themselves temple, altar, tapers, incense, the savour of sacrifice, a host of priests and train of ceremonies; on the contrary, he calls men to place themselves at his feet: "Come, and I will speak with you."

These men who conjoin religion and word fall into two groups; those who are conscious that in so acting they are accomplishing something noteworthy, and those who do not give a thought to the noteworthiness of their action. The first class, who realize what they are doing, necessarily become critics of the forms and means of religion which have been and are customary. They make war upon temple,

priest, incense, church. Jesus does not belong to this group, but to the naïve class who do not reflect upon such matters. He feels no necessity to become an iconoclast, to throw down altars, to close the temple. He can indeed make his entrance therein. When he perceives that prayer in such a place is made impossible because of the traffic done at money-changers' stands and stalls where doves are sold, he can pick up the lash and purify the place from a religion of traffic. But just as naturally he can speak with entire calmness of the fact that there will be a time when no stone of the temple will remain upon another, and that day has for him no terrors when neither at Jerusalem nor at Gerizim men will offer their prayers, when no longer priest nor temple shall exist. For all true prayer to God is in spirit and in truth; this kind of prayer needs none of those paraphernalia. But he cannot think of the time when the union of word and of religion shall be severed. Temple may fall and priesthood pass away, heaven and earth vanish, but his word shall not perish. That was his consciousness, so he valued his word.

With this introduction we arrive at the

particular matter which is the object of our investigation,* namely, How did Jesus employ this instrument of the word? And we start from the form which he used. The preaching of Jesus expressed itself in threefold form: (1) he proclaimed the kingdom of heaven, (2) he expounded the laws of his people, (3) he spoke in proverbs and in parables. These three characteristics of style, preaching of the kingdom of heaven, exposition of the law, and proverbial method of speech, were not invented by Jesus but were adopted by him. He used the methods of address which were customary among his people in the propounding of religious truths. But these three forms of employment of the word in preaching have greater significance than that which they have as methods of style used by Jesus. As a general fact, form and content are in closest union. So it is with Jesus; every method in style employed by him is bound up with a definite complex of frame

* In order to avoid raising expectations which the following performance will not satisfy, it is here explicitly noted that the theme does not call for an exposition of the teaching of Jesus; what is in mind is an investigation of "Jesus as teacher," that is to say, the genius and method of his preaching.

of mind and view, a wholly determined type of piety. Whoever uses a style of this character can not help combining with it the connected aggregates of frame of mind and view. There consequently resulted the complicated phenomenon that Jesus expressed what he had to say not in new forms, words, thoughts, opinions, but in the methods of expression, with the same concept-material, under the forms customary to the type of piety, which were already in existence and in use in the region. Explanation of this fact might be based upon psychological and pedagogical grounds. It might be said that Jesus must follow this method in order to be understood by his hearers, must speak a language which was current and suited to the capacities of the people. The religious language employed among the Hebrews was the language of the expectation of the Messiah, exposition of the law, and apothegmatic declarations. Such an explanation would be correct, only that the mentality of Jesus himself must be taken into the account; for Jesus had for his own thinking no other language; the modes of expression and views which were current were those which he normally employed.

And such is the usual course of things, for even the greatest genius does not create everything new. Such a one takes the heritage from the past, adds to it something new, and —what is of the highest significance—welds the whole into new forms. Of creation in the mental world there is in the absolute sense none. Mental life is ever historical life, and history is only the confirmation, enrichment, and reconstruction of the mental treasures of the past. It is our task to follow out in what we may have to say this interesting process in the work of Jesus, to note how he took up into his nature the mental heritage of his people, enriched it through his nature, and reconstructed it in that nature; we have to consider how he turned about the old threads, spun new ones, dissolved old connections and supplied others.

This condition of things, the fact that Jesus inserted a new woof into the web, already existent, of the religion of his folk, and that this woof bore the stamp of his own originality, leads to a further fundamental observation. It may have been noticed that in our discussion we carefully avoided the expression "teaching of Jesus" and substituted for

it another: "how did Jesus employ the word?" "Teaching" is used to convey the idea of a settled and closed circle of completed views. Of the existence of such a "teaching," according to the confirmed observations already made, there can in the case of Jesus be no affirmation. We may not picture to ourselves a new and completed temple of learning erected by him and installed in the landscape of the mental life of his people; the appropriate figure is that of a seed which he sowed in the soil of this mental life, which seed took up into itself the material of that soil and transformed it into higher forms. The "teaching of Jesus" is a living process which even up to the present has not ceased to be active. The method of Jesus has continued in process of expansion, diffusing itself from people to people and stretching on from age to age. We have to delineate, in this discussion of the preaching of Jesus to the Hebrew people, the beginning of an endless development, to set forth the first operations which the appearance of Jesus started into action. Consequently there is not to be expected something that is final, something which can be placed under strict and sharply

defined categories; we are not to make a collection of the teaching of Jesus arranged under so many captions and in a definite number of paragraphs. Our task is the much more interesting one of discovering how a great man and a pious began the work of influencing the mental and spiritual history of mankind. It is ours to exhibit beginnings which have a wide outlook for the future, because we are to deal with something that has life, and nothing that has life is finished. This living process of the working of Jesus upon the heritage of the past we shall follow out in the three lines of preaching of the kingdom of heaven, exposition of the law, and employment of apothegmatic sayings.

## I

### PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

Our Gospels are at one in reporting to us that Jesus entered upon his ministry with the message: "The kingdom of God is at hand." This proposition concerning the imminence of the kingdom of heaven (or the kingdom of God—the expressions are synony-

mous) was, as we have already stated, not newly created by Jesus, it had a history behind it which reached through centuries. Many souls, great and small, had put forth their religious announcement to men in this form. Immediately before Jesus, John the Baptist had injected new life and a new content into it; he had rendered the old thoughts and tendencies and stimuli instinct with new life and motion. But among all the great achievements which were his the greatest is that through his preaching of the nearness of the kingdom of heaven he stirred to action the soul of the carpenter of Nazareth. As the continuator of the work of John, and as his disciple and scholar, Jesus still further diffused this message of the proximity of the kingdom of God. The message was the same, and yet—how different it became as he voiced it!

As it came from John this message involved the following particulars: (1) The preaching of the kingdom of heaven is the announcement of an immediately impending conflict between divine and demonic power with the possession of the earth as the stake; (2) this conflict is to end with a victory for the govern-

ment of God, and this, as a new ordering of all relations, came from above and from the outside upon the earth and to men; (3) the proclamation of these imminent events was to effect a decided alteration in the relations of mankind; (4) in order to produce these effects there were employed the mighty motives of fear and of hope. Now what was it that issued, as Jesus employed it, out of this mass of thought and stimuli which, as you perceive, was the source of a hot, glowing, heroic religious intensity? In the first place, there was a harking back both in method and in content. A considerable part of the work of Jesus took the form of the preaching of repentance and judgment, which employed as material the old series of thoughts, conceptions, and disposition. Those parts of the proclamation of Jesus naturally strike us as strange; but then, that whole conception of the essence and task of religion which is bound up with the idea of the kingdom of God is in its greatness and intensity strange. It has a foreign ring when Jesus speaks of seeing the devil fall from heaven, when he tells of the twelve thrones from which his disciples are in the future to judge the world, and when he re-

employs that old system which thinks of a judgment and a reward which are objective. But with this world of judgment and divine government goes at once extensive alteration. Jesus does not do away with the world, but he, so to speak, removes it a bit farther away from itself. This kingdom of God—so runs the formula to which Jesus comes at last—will come to realization at his second advent. Then the Son of man is to be seen sitting at the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven. He does not yet appear in this form in this his earthly existence. When curiosity seeks to know when the long expected event is to occur, he closes its mouth: "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power" [Acts i. 8]. We are all aware that things which withdraw into remoteness and are viewed from afar do not operate any more with the same immediateness, efficiency, and overwhelming force. So is it with the erection of the government of God which is to complete itself with the accompaniment of external signs. It loses something of its immediate puissance, somewhat is missing from the acute interest in it. One might perhaps

without shocking the sensibilities introduce here a comparison with the ideal future state of social democracy. In this there is an ideal the realization of which is longingly looked for, the immediate attainment of which men await, yet it gradually withdraws into the more distant future and thereby loses, as we are aware, much of its stimulus, color, and interest. But above all, by this withdrawal into the distance, there arises between the present and the distant future a free space, a sort of limited stage upon which events are to occur which in some way or other must work themselves out; indeed through these events social democracy is actually to realize itself by means of the ever stronger practical co-operation in the same fellowship, which, according to the theory, is of value in proportion to its thoroughness. It is exactly this way with the expectation entertained by Jesus of the kingdom of God, only that with him it is not external facts which have postponed the supreme event and have created a limited stage in the shape of an intermediate state. As he viewed it, the case was more like this: there was something in the essence of the idea which aimed to work out its accomplish-

ment, which needed room in which to be able to work, and hence proceeded to create the room which was so necessary to it by patiently pushing to the rear the side scenes of the end of the world until it had made the space required for its own complete working out. However, all that in the mean time makes toward the establishment of the kingdom through Jesus and his disciples is also by Jesus denominated "the kingdom of heaven." A fact which makes his preaching of the kingdom of heaven difficult to understand is that at one time those events which are connected with the end of time are included and designated under the term "kingdom of heaven," while at another time whatever is the result of his operation between the present and the emergence of the final period is so called. Still (in accordance with the method of Jesus), whatever is now enacted upon the stage of life detaches itself, although it is designated by the same name, from that early world of thought which is conserved by Jesus.

Here four points of variation stand out, and they, moreover, form a connection with the four chief points of the representation mentioned above as setting forth the old idea

of the kingdom of God. (1) There rages on the limited stage existing between the present and the time of the end a consuming conflict, and the two powers which fight are the same as are to lead the world-battle at the end of time—God and the devil. But it is to be noted that the object of the conflict is different; the strife is for the possession of the souls of men. Wherever the soul of man is won from delirium, sickness, need, sensuality, selfishness, and past guilt, there a victory is won for the kingdom of God. From this point of view it was that Jesus could say in his great defence before the Pharisees, referring to the two demoniacs who had been healed by him: "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you" [Matt. xii. 28]. For his opponents this was not sufficient. When the subject of discussion was the kingdom of heaven, they desired to see more than a couple of maniacs restored to sanity, a couple of paralytics walking about, or a couple of converted Magdalens. The disposition of Jesus was entirely different; for him all importance attached to those two souls, in exuberant pictures he portrayed for us the consuming interest in

heaven in the contest for the individual souls, and told how the halls of heaven were flooded with jubilees when one such victory had been gained. To save souls from maniacy, need, and guilt and to unite those saved souls in a new fellowship of souls is the kingdom of heaven realized.

(2) Hereupon falls away another characteristic of the early conception of the kingdom of heaven, namely that it comes from above downward, suddenly, with a crash, and establishes itself on earth by a miracle. Yet Jesus did not combat this conception—indeed all this is to eventuate; but in the meanwhile there unfolds in the midst of this earth which is devoted to destruction a new existence, a new eon. The new comes unheralded and of itself. In the souls of men who are saved and blessed it begins to grow, just as the mustard seed grows in the ground and as the leaven develops in the baker's trough. Thou mayest even—he once said—go peacefully to thy home, mayest eat and drink, sleep and arise; even then in the soul it grows and continues to grow. There is a new principle there, the kingdom of heaven is realized. When Jesus sees men ever looking with long-

ing for the day of judgment and of the state which comes in the future, he can call to them: "the kingdom of God cometh not with outward show; neither shall they say Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is already within you" [Luke xviii. 20-21]. For already the sower has gone forth to cast his seed not in the wide world but within, in the hearts of men; and although much fell upon poor soil, yet there was that which fell on good land and bore fruit, so that there ripens in the meantime a fruit unto eternity. In place of the world-revolution from without comes the development of the soul from within.

(3) Development of the soul—you feel that with this phrase we have arrived at a process the conception of which does not coincide with the old thought-series of a divine realm which suddenly breaks upon men. To the thought of a divine realm thus suddenly coming in upon men there corresponded the idea of a sudden rapid and total change in the life of the soul, also the thought of repentance in its original sense of a sudden and instantaneous single act. It was that repentance which John preached, and the

same is found to day in the preaching of repentance common to the usual form of piety which has to do with the imminence of the end. This piety which is intent upon the immediately imminent kingdom of God has no time to lose, it cannot wait, may not allow the soul to develop and unfold; its cry is: "Today, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts; already is the axe laid at the root of the tree." While words similar in tone spoken by Jesus can often enough be found, yet in the midst of this old world of stormy conversions in the eleventh hour another world establishes itself, the world of peaceful and constant care and fostering of the soul. It is probable that not many passages from our sources can be cited in proof of this quiet work directed upon the soul, for it is an operation which does not fit in well with literary purposes. But reference may be made to the activity of Jesus exercised upon his disciples, to the scenes between him and Mary of Bethany, to the retrospect upon his life-work which issued from him on the Mount of Olives; with such evidence present, one may well feel that the activity of Jesus is not correctly described if the account is limited to

his work as a preacher of repentance having in view the end of things.

(4) In a similar vein a last remark is to be made concerning the motives which Jesus sought to disengage in the heart of man to the end that he might win a hearing for his message. The incitement employed by the older preaching of the kingdom of heaven was hope and fear. The preacher of repentance allowed the terrors of the impending judgment to permeate his sermons, and with the use of more or less vivid coloring he instilled in the soul of his audience alarm lest they come under the terrible penalty imposed by that judgment. Or, on the other hand, he conjured up another series of pictures which presented the sweet joys of eternal felicity or the satisfaction which comes through the all-availing righteousness of God, setting forth the condition when once and for all evil shall be punished and good rewarded. Now Jesus did not at all eschew the use of this material. He could picture vividly the anguish of hell; in describing the state of eternal blessedness he was in general more reserved. He can without hesitation employ as a motive the expectation of reward, and can adduce as con-

solation for sacrifice made in the present the hundred-fold indemnification which is to be received in the kingdom of God. But when the subject is actively brought to his consciousness, he shrinks from including religion in the scheme which involves external reward and punishment; and so, when he has gained entire freedom, he is heard using quite another tone and emphasis. Then expected recompense is transformed into a feeling of blessedness that is already present; man is thus early blessed in that and because he has living experience of his God. To be sure, this line of thought is first clearly brought out by the Fourth Gospel, where it is made to appear that the judgment is already a past event, that "eternal life" has even now come to realization in the soul. The Gospel of John, then, exhibits the pearl disassociated from the sands of the earlier expositions; the words of the first three Gospels do no more than show this pearl glimmering among the sands. What shines out through this declaration of Jesus is that out of the heaven which is awaited in fear and in hope there develops the heaven which every one prizes in his own soul as a choice possession. Religion is no

more the suspense between hope and fear; it is experience, it is the happiness of experimental knowledge.

The new conception of the kingdom of heaven which is substituted for the older one consists of salvation of the soul, communion of souls, development of soul. Under the influence of its brilliancy the old background is totally forgotten, and after one has looked upon it, he himself reflects something of the brilliancy and beauty of this new true kingdom of heaven—a fact which may be verified by the words of Jesus.*

I may not turn away from this exposition of Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of heaven without drawing a conclusion which to me seems especially important for the understanding of Jesus in the present day. It re-

* I recall, for instance, how in the representation of blessedness under the figure of a festal meal the emphasis is placed no more upon the completeness and splendor of the joys of the table, but upon the much more subtle happiness which arises in the spiritual fellowship with the other members of the circle present. One may remember, also, how in the parable of the rich man and the beggar, Lazarus, and also in the narrative dealing with the distinction made at the eternal judgment between the sheep and the goats the stress is placed upon matters quite other than is the case when apocalyptic is employed.

lates to the question: In what department of life has Jesus something to say which immediately interests us? And I may annex this discussion to the account of an event, small in itself yet already celebrated, which occurred on Friedrich Naumann's journey in the orient in 1898. Naumann thus reports it in his *Asia* (Berlin, 1899): "It was a day on the stony road from Nablus to Jerusalem when a fellow traveller propounded the question whether Jesus, who, so far as we know, travelled this route twice, walked or rode. Paul rode, and Jesus made his entrance to Jerusalem seated upon an ass; so either mode of travel is a possibility. Either method whether he went on foot or rode, is alike little compatible with the fact which till now we had before us—the road itself made the distinction. Jesus travelled or rode on such a highway without doing anything to improve it. Whoever supposes that before now that road should have been made better would come to another opinion if he should reflect sufficiently upon *the stone*. The Jesus who up to the present time has been known to us lived in a land that had been put in order. In such a land he longed for the adjustment

of relation between rich and poor by means of the spirit of brotherhood. That he lived where the first essentials of social progress were lacking, and that he did not discuss the necessity of such progress, became of significance to me as soon as I began to read the New Testament with the eyes of a traveller in Palestine. I then lost something which had been of great value to me—the idea of an earthly helper who saw all kinds of earthly needs."

Many who are here present will know how everything seemed with Naumann to fall with a crash, even more than he himself realized and expressed in those words—nothing more nor less than his entire Christian-social past, the whole of Jesus as he had known him. Many now before me have themselves experienced that crash of destruction when, under the stress of scientific knowledge, they came to know that they must sacrifice the conception of Jesus hitherto held by them, of a Jesus to whom nothing human was foreign, who could offer help for every need and was ready to make answer to every question—when they found that they must displace it with the idea of an austere Jesus, in-

tent upon one side only, who had no interest in man except that he is a soul. Had Jesus no word for social progress, for the further development of human fellowship, no word for the inherent worth of the family, of law, of the State, art, science, culture? Sharply and distinctly comes to us the answer from the Gospels—not a word. In respect to a whole series of questions which burn in the soul of the present Jesus remained mute; he neither felt them nor, for part at least, had he the wish to feel them. He knew but two things, God and the soul, souls and their God.* If he spoke of fellowship, he had not in mind that of a legal character such as meets us in the State, in business, in the different strata of social life, in the life of the handicrafts, marriage, the family, and the like. He felt the opposition between the two kinds of

* In order to avoid misunderstanding it should be emphasized here that from the conception involved in the formula "God and the soul" (in the singular) there results no necessity to take in the entire horizon of Jesus' vision. Souls were not for him monads of exclusive constitution; they were marked by the social instinct. But Jesus had interest only in the finer threads of the communion of souls that become united; not in the joint life which results from legal and social relations, which issues out of legal regulation.

fellowship; he knew that "the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you" [Matt. xx. 25-26]. From his point of view things assumed value according to their influence upon the soul and as they had bearing in this particular case upon this individual soul, according as they harmed or aided the soul. Hence it follows that for Jesus neither family nor calling, neither State nor law, neither production nor consumption, neither progress nor retrogression in civilization had interest in itself. One thing is needful: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" [Matt. vi. 33]. "Your time, your interests, your power," he taught his disciples, "are not to be given to things which belong in such categories as the matters already mentioned. Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on, and render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." The disciples of Jesus have something better to do than to waste thought upon questions which concern the warrant for taxation and politics.

We are not concerned here and now in settling the question whether we must, can, or may continue in the line here directed by Jesus—that is a question demanding its own consideration. Nor may we stop here to discuss the reason for this "one-sidedness" of Jesus. Our present purpose is to learn what Jesus was and in what respects he is strange to us. The result is that what Jesus had to say did not cover the whole range, did not comprehend the wide circle of human demands and operations. His words fathom the depths; and the new thing which he added was precisely this, that he circumscribed the area of religion and limited its content so that there were to be considered in religion only two concerns—God, who was yearning for souls, and souls, which were created with a Godward design.

## II

### EXPOSITION OF THE LAW

The second method used by Jesus in his proclamation of his message to men was the exposition of the law. The Gospels are studded with notes to the effect that Jesus

taught the people. This instruction of the people is therefore sharply distinguished from his preaching of the kingdom of heaven—a fact which comes out in the vocabulary by the use of two different words. This teaching of the people by Jesus was nothing else than the elucidation of the law, an activity which was the life task of the rabbis. It is common knowledge that by his contemporaries Jesus was greeted as a rabbi, i. e., expounder of the law, and was so rated by them. Many of his expositions are lost, but enough material remains to furnish a picture of this kind of work. We are under especial obligations to the Evangelist Matthew for furnishing a very excellent collection of the expositions of the law by Jesus, which collection, as you know, is the first part of the so-called Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. and the first part of vi.).

The type of piety which employed as its particular province the matter of the law and its exposition is from the very beginning of an altogether different character from that which proclaimed the kingdom of heaven. The preaching of the kingdom of heaven transported a man from the present into the future, it induced in him the fiery heat of

highest stress, it pointed out the salient features of the world drama, it set him face to face with the great—Either, or! The piety which dealt with the law was soberer, more matter of fact, an everyday concern, exhibiting more of the martinet. It was not concerned with fiery ardor and great distractions; it looked upon everyday life with its thousand varied situations and questions. Religion came into the life of man as a regulating force; its verbal expressions addressed to mankind were: "Thou shalt, and thou shalt not." Religion become practical addressed itself neither to feeling nor to thinking, for it had no time for either of these, having to control the entire activity of man both in doing and in omitting to do. In order to accomplish this great, immeasurable task, it wrought out a fine-meshed net of individual prescriptions of such close construction that if possible no single situation in life, no individual "case" should remain unconsidered. In this way religion became casuistry. It struck a treaty with jurisprudence, and the holy books, which decade by decade became thicker, compare exactly with the *Corpus juris*. From jurisprudence it borrowed the

motives which it would set in motion in men; it operated with the means of the law—punishment and reward. No other people reduced this legalistic piety to the degree of virtuosity which was wrought out by the Jews at the time of Jesus. * Unfortunately the time at our disposal forbids that we stop to adduce examples of this.

Now this style and this type of piety was not left unemployed by Jesus. Indeed, at first glance it might appear as though he was but one of a long series of rabbis who there at the Sea of Gennesaret patched up and made ever smaller in its mesh the spiritual net for the peasants and fishermen of Galilee. Since from his lips too fell time and again the legal sounding "Thou shalt, and thou shalt not," even at his hands religion seemed to be

* Translator's Note:—The attempt to cover all the possible contingencies of life by appropriate legislation is not peculiar to the Hebrews, and they have not carried it to greater excess than highly developed religious life has prompted among other peoples. One may adduce, as a few examples of this, the Apastamba, Gautama, Vasishtha, and Baudhayana of Brahmanism, the Patimokkha, Mahavagga, and Kullavagga of Buddhists, and the Shayast la-Shayast of Zoroastrians. These are all accessible in English translation in the *Sacred Books of the East.*

but the advance to men of a new law. As with the rest of the rabbis, it appeared as though he too considered that everything depended upon right performance without reference to feeling and perception. "Not every one that saith unto me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven" [Matt. vii. 21]. And if the question is raised, What is that will? from him as from the rabbis we receive series of prescriptions of single duties. He tells us what man must do when he prays, what he must avoid when he fasts, how he must carry himself when he gives alms, what his course of conduct should be after accepting an invitation, how he is to act when assaulted, or when his wife is untrue to him, or when a lawsuit is in process, or when a loan has been made. All this belongs to the very framework of a piety which is legalistic and in the exact spirit of the rabbis. And yet —legalistic as is the ring of all this—it is in fact the opposite of legalistic, it is really the dissolution and annulment of legalism in religion. This was felt by those simple peasants of Galilee at the first exposition of the

law by Jesus. In our oldest source it is related that, on that first sabbath when Jesus set forth the law to them in the little synagogue at Capernaum, they left the place with the impression: He preaches not as the other rabbis, but as one who (to translate verbally) has authority in himself. They perceived the new spirit which employed the old method and the old conceptual material, and they expressed the difference in the method of Jesus from that used by legalistic piety, employed though this latter was by Jesus both in form and style, going to the root by saying that Jesus was one whose authority was internal, and by noting the internal and firm assurance which streamed forth from him in his words. In legalistic religion what occurred was the strongest possible self repression of the personal individuality of the expounder of the law, whose business it was conceived to be to suppress his own feelings and sensations, his personal will and desires. There was an external authority with which he dealt, to which he was bound to listen for the conclusions which were to be applied to the individual cases and situations of life. The requirements thus enunciated became thenceforth govern-

ing authority. The authority was everything and the man by whom it was uttered was nothing: "Let justice be done though the earth perish!" All this meets in Jesus a transformation. He worked from within outward, started from his perceptions, from his own ethical judgment. The organ which governed his own action or restraint from action lay in his own breast. Whenever a perplexing question arose concerning the right method of action in this or that case, Jesus did not have punctilious recourse to a law book to turn its leaves for a certain paragraph, that through exposition and application of the prescription found there he might offer the advice suitable to the matter in hand. In such a situation he searched in his own breast and there with incontestable and primal certainty discovered the form of conduct. If this inner authority harmonized with external authority, well and good; if there was dissidence between external authority and his inner voice, Jesus did not hesitate, even were that external authority the highest known to his people—the law of Moses—to oppose and overrule the external for his own inner certitude: "Ye have heard that it was said to

them of olden time, . . . but I say unto you." The suffrage of this "I" annulled the suffrage of Moses. Everything legalistic ceased to be when the subject demanded boldly a place above all objective authority, and instead of the "thou shalt" of prescriptive law there came into expression the "I must" of inner necessity.

But, it is asked, is it not a fact that Jesus displaced the old law by a new one which was enacted by himself, so that he did away with the law of the scribes and substituted for it the Christian law? In that case we have but changed lawgivers; instead of Moses Jesus has come forth. Those among you who have read church history are acquainted with the fact that very early it was assumed that this change had taken place, and that the preaching of Jesus was applied as a "new law." But the only thing accomplished by this was to assert but a very coarse power in the words of Jesus. Those words can be applied to almost any other purpose than to act as stones in such a structure, as paragraphs in a new law book. Objectively taken and applied, one command of Jesus often enough opposes another, one prescription undoes

what was formulated on an earlier occasion. Understood as legalistic instructions, the declarations of Jesus are incomplete, disconnected, discordant, even contradictory; they lack unity and logical conclusiveness, and instead of making clear the path of man, they lead him from confusion to confusion. Used as laws, they are a host of discords and disharmonies. But these declarations lose instantly the semblance of disconnection and contradiction when one ceases to look upon them as legal maxims and finds the true unity which lies behind them. Then not only does each word ring out in pure and clear tones, but when the apparently discordant declarations are taken together there is built up a wonderful accord, and the whole of the preaching of Jesus, so far as it has been transmitted to us, swells out into a mighty, ravishing harmony. For there really is such a unity, with which all the particulars are in accord. This unity does not inhere, however, in an objective legislative *corpus,* but in the subject of the promulgating personality. That man is well on the way to an understanding of the words of Jesus who recognizes in them the projections of the soul life of Jesus upon

the background of human happenings. With this we arrive at the central point of the present discussion and to make this more intelligible I may be permitted the use of a figure. The sun radiates its light upon the world spaces by reason of its own inner power, but the operations of this light come into recognition in its particulars because of the phenomenon that it falls upon objects and bathes them in its own being. The one light radiates these operations of its own in the form of the most varied tones and colors, and comes to our eyes in infinite shadings and plays in gradation. What we see are the operations of the one light; but the variegated world of objects on which it falls so affects it that here there meets the eye a brilliant red, there a soft green, yonder a blended white. What falls on the retina is a combination of the illuminating light and the illuminated object. It is just this way with the words of Jesus; they are a reflection of human life in the light of Jesus' discernment. They show us what operations in his soul were called forth by the events of the world about him, by the acts and the omissions of men. It is this which makes his words sound so

different at different times. This variation arises from the circumstances into the center of which his being came, these circumstances calling forth from him appropriate expressions corresponding to reflections of light in the world of illumination. Hence it comes about that the voice of Jesus can at one time be heard saying: "He that is not with me is against me" [Matt. xii. 30]. That is the way it speaks when the time is one for decision. But at another time, when intolerance and narrowness are to be checked, it may be heard saying: "He that is not against us is on our part" [Mark ix. 40]. It can take into account a piety which places affected ceremonial commands above the simple and natural obligations of children, and can commend those obligations as the most beautiful bloom of filial piety; but when mother love and motherly indiscretion pass due bounds, from it may issue the sharp utterance: "Who is my mother and who are my brethren; he that hateth not father, mother, brothers, sisters, is not worthy of me" [cf. Matt. x. 37, xii. 48; Mark iii. 33; Luke xiv. 26]. This method of Jesus can enforce the lesson: "I say unto you, That ye resist not evil; but who-

soever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" [Matt. v. 39]; and in another hour it can meet the unrighteous blow with the remonstrance: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?" [John xviii. 28]. Logically these are contradictory; it seems like the reed in the wind if the measure applied is objective teaching. But all these contradictions blend into harmony in which one tone supports and strengthens another if only a man has learned to recognize them as the irradiations of a unitary soul life upon the varied discrepant world of reality. For this varied contradictory life brings it about that today that is false which yesterday was correct, that here I smite and there I heal, that one I must forgive and another I must punish, that what for that one is an inner craving is for me a damage to the soul; that which poisons me may be another's healing medicine. Life is so many-sided that we cannot embrace within prescriptions a life-line of conduct. The fish slip through the meshes of the casuistry, or else the net becomes so confining that it cuts off the breath and makes free motion impossible. And how assured

Jesus was of this as he spoke of the unendurable burdens of legalism and of the unnatural constriction of all mental life (and spiritual) which comes about through casuistry! Was he the kind of man to substitute a new net for the old one?

Of course, the answer is negative. What he did is this: he sent forth his being in rays upon the world that girdled it, he exhibited the reaction of his being upon the surrounding reality, he showed how his being valued the action and non-action of men. And then he said: "Go thou and do likewise. Work thou and make thy decisions from within outward. The robes of external restraints with which thou clothest thyself have no value. From within outward must thy whole being be projected: a good tree can produce only good fruit and an evil tree only evil fruit. Therefore from within outwards become new." And in accomplishing this he will help us. But this help will not come by our making ourselves casts from him as the model and by externally imitating that which he said and did under totally different stimuli and amid essentially different circumstances. What is required is that freely, like the artist,

we shall mould the masterpiece of our soul after the pattern and antitype of his being. To create unfettered and independent personalties that should carry within themselves the measure of their own action or non-action, that, like himself, should be exalted above submission to the yoke of an external authority, this was his aim. And that you may accomplish this he would give assistance by the irradiation of his own being. It may be that in your actions you contravene the tenor of the words of Jesus and even yet maintain their spirit; for the letter kills and the spirit makes alive. When we turn the leaves of the Sermon on the Mount, the words of Jesus do not have the effect of paragraphs from a law book which bids and forbids, commands and enslaves, threatens and punishes. Out of them gleams upon us an ethical ideal which does not constrain but allures and invites, which does not enslave but draws us upward, which does not punish but blesses. Indeed, there is more than this; above the ideal we are introduced to a concrete man of flesh and blood like ourselves in whom this ideal has taken shape in clear, sharply defined form. So this human-histori-

cal form emerges before struggling, fighting, suffering humanity and utters the word which no law and no doctrine can speak, which only an untrammelled personality may utter to other personalities: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; . . .for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light" [Matt. xi. 28-30].

## III

### THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE PROVERBIAL METHOD

The third means used by Jesus in the attempt to bring his preaching home to men is the proverb. And this form often develops into the parable by means of materials drawn from the events and observations occurring in and made upon human life. There come to memory an entire series of such short sayings by which Jesus succeeded in blocking out a situation with lightning quickness or hewed through an involved knot with sharp spiritual blade. In order that we may have before us material suited to the purpose of our investigation, I may recall to your memory a few

such short sayings, chosen altogether arbitrarily. When the disciples were plucking on the sabbath ears of corn in order to satisfy a natural need, Jesus defended them against the charge of sabbath-breaking with the proverb: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" [Mark ii. 27]. When the pious in the land scorned him for his association with the children of the world, he exhibited the heart of the purpose for which he came into the world better in a single line than could have been done by a long exposition: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick" [Matt. ix. 12]. When some would constrain him and his disciples to an external religious observance which was in direct opposition to the disposition of their minds (they would have Jesus and his disciples fast while their mental attitude was one of joy), he convinced every soundly constituted and clear thinking man of the correctness of his and his disciples' position by the simple words: "Can the children of the bridechamber fast?" [Mark ii. 19]. On other occasions he did not spare the use of irony; such a case is furnished when the explanation was wrung from him by holy earn-

estness concerning what constitutes real defilement of our being, which proceeds from the lower lusts and quagmires that have their origin in the heart of men: "But to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man" [Matt. xv. 20].

Here we seem finally to have parted company with those difficult and wearying investigations which were necessary when we were studying the preaching of the kingdom of God and the exposition of the law, in which we were compelled to distinguish between the transient shell, through which we had to make our way, and the sweet kernel which then was disclosed to our view. The proverbs of Jesus ring so fresh, so immediately human, they seem to us to have nothing of the manners of a past that is two thousand years away. And this feeling is justified. We have had occasion previously to cite the words: "He teaches not as the scribes teach," and once more their appropriateness is evident. For how freshly does varied and real life flow through the proverbs and parables of Jesus! We have left far behind us the dusty rolls and narrow spaces of the scribes, and we let ourselves be led by Jesus to field and meadow, to

blossoming anemones and singing birds, to the sprouting seed and the click of the sickel. And how grateful are his descriptions of the life of man, neither distorted into a world-weary pessimism nor painted with the pencil of adornment that is world-intoxicated! In realistic truth flows before us the stream of events, of human passions, conflicts, defeats, and victories, and—a new and surprising picture—upon its waves it carries the ship of piety. Religion has obtained an entirely new vehicle; it uses no more the phantasy of expectation of the kingdom of heaven nor does it employ now the law book of the rabbis; its new carriage is the reality of life itself. Who has not experienced the witchery of this picture and has not gladly fled ever away from the ambiguity and artificiality into which our piety so often falls to-day, coming with joy into the simplicity and naturalness of the proverbs and parables of Jesus?

But even here where all is so immediately felt, so present, so modern, we must grant to history its rights. More than he guesses who is not familiar with the history of religious methods and religious views do the proverbs and parables of Jesus wear the robes which

belong to those times. Many a time, even today, does this show itself in glimpses to him who watches, and this is especially true of the conclusions which Jesus draws in his proverbs. These sprang up upon the ground of rabbinic logic and psychology. But beyond all this, the entire religious view of things which spreads its illumination from the heart of Jesus' proverbs and parables is throughout not a new thing. One might formulate the fact somewhat this way: religion becomes something intelligible and in accordance with reason. In the proverbial wisdom of his people, which in the days of Jesus already had a long history behind it, the practice was assumed and ever more widely diffused of conceiving religion as something which corresponded to sound human understanding. There are extant a whole series of Jewish writings which belong to the times immediately before and after Jesus which preach a religion that illumines the understanding and does no violence to the intelligence. They call it rationalism. By some this rationalism has been prized as the greatest step in advance made by religion. Here prospered the religion which made its way

from the lower regions of human motives, coming at last to the clear daylight and striking a treaty with the light-forms of reason and science. Others, however, regard rationalism as religion in its deepest poverty: religion has lost its mystery! All the shallow places into which the reason can sink is filled with the rumble of conceptions, and every stone of stumbling over which the understanding can trip is cast aside. All is smooth and—flat. Religion under rationalism changes into mere prudential maxims: "do right and fear none," and "what thou wouldst that others should do unto thee do thou also unto others."

Is then the preaching of Jesus in his proverbs and parables rationalism? In form, yes! He can sum up the content of all religion (law and prophets) in the saying: "All that thou wouldst that men do unto thee, do thou unto them." He can, especially when face to face with the affectation and ambiguity of the religion which was all about him, call as witness sound human understanding and can take the natural perceptions of men as a court of appeal for the decision of such ethical and religious questions as are upon the carpet. But again we shall misunderstand Jesus

if we look upon him as nothing more than an advocate of the rationalism that then was current. All that he said and all that he claimed is logical and natural, provided that his premises and antecedents be granted. But those who do this do something quite non-rational, at all events something which soured human understanding, as it itself claimed, had not done up to that time. I recur again to the examples already cited, which were collected almost at random. Of course the physician is for the sick and not for the sound. But the important thing, the new and the "irrational" in the saying, is that religion may not be compared to jurisprudence, but is related to the healing art; so that the juridical categories of requital, punishment, satisfaction and all the rest of such things are not in accordance with religion. If what Jesus said was so rational, how does it come about that with his advent these conceptions did not fall away finally from religion and that the natural tendency of religion even under Christianity is ever to fall back into the old juristic bed? It is certainly absurd and impious to act against one's own experience, to do that for which there is absolutely no inner prompting (as, for ex-

ample, to fast under the conditions noted above). Yet it is a fact that we are not to-day free from this inconsistency; how often both within and without the Church do men so conform to current practice that the "rational" voice of Jesus may be heard exclaiming "thou playest the hypocrite." Once more—could there be a more natural figure of the methods of religious propaganda and missions than that of the sower. Nevertheless, we have already caught sight of the fact that men continually seek to propagate religion through means that are entirely different; they work through sacrifice, priests, incense, candles, sacraments, miracles, artificial constructions, and even through unethical coercion. Is the parable of the sower then really so rational? Finally, how completely human and grateful to our feelings is the knowledge that the sabbath is made for man and not the reverse, that religion would fain be not a tyrant over us but a friend to us. And yet over and over again we have the experience that in the world consideration is paid only to a church that is dressed up in finery, fitted up with pomp, authority, and temporal power,

while Jesus' method of homely service receives only disrespect and scorn.

I trust that the examples alleged have made clear the most important point, namely, that the proverbs of Jesus take the form of maxims of wisdom which call forth the agreement of the reason, but that in truth their primal application is not to the understanding or to the reason, but to the will. The religion which Jesus preached has absolutely nothing to do with rationalism or with its opposite, supernaturalism; for its intention is to pierce to the center of things in the heart and conscience. For in the will-life of man there is seated an enemy much stronger than he could possibly be were he found only in the life of the understanding. Here is entrenched a natural power which is to be overcome; out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. This contest with our idleness, sensuality, and selfishness is not to be compared in difficulty and obstinacy with the strife about the sensibleness and reasonableness of religion; unless you are born anew, you can not enter the kingdom of heaven. The task of religion is not to satisfy the understanding

nor to act contrary to it nor to twist it out of shape; its aim is to renew hearts. Whoever has found, as Jesus found, this as the content of religion, for him the distinction between rationalism and supernaturalism has become a mere shadow.

Such a one has moreover found stronger stakes by which to fasten in the soul of man the cords of religion. They penetrate far deeper into the inner self than where reason and science and thought have their seat in the mental life. If one fastens religion to the stakes of reasonableness and understanding, there often arises a storm in the life of the soul in which the lines part and the stakes break. Jesus placed it much deeper, indeed—in most "irrational" manner—in the very place where the arch-fiend of religion has his dwelling place, in the will and the heart. The most potent impulses to piety lie not outside man but in him. Never did religion stand forth before us in so great might, so imposingly, so immediately, as when Jesus put aside all other motives and helps and appealed simply to the conscience, and never did ungodliness appear more wretched in our sight than when it characterized Jesus as unscrupulous.

But never did Jesus present more realistically the imposing force of religion than when he permitted his voice to manifest itself as the voice of our own heart. What is the source of the immediately convicting power of the parable of the prodigal son? Simply that Jesus interprets the voice of the heart, which expresses itself in the conduct of the father, as also the voice of God. It is a dangerous but a noble piety which makes men venture to say: "What thy heart says to thee, that says thy God." A higher nobility than this can none confer upon man. In the organon of the personal life God reveals himself most completely and most intimately. Here man becomes the container of the divine and here the divine becomes the content of humanity. Here God and man become one in the last analysis, and as the demonstration to us of this unity of God and man emerges the God-Man, the personality Jesus.

My friends, I have attempted to point out to you three lines which the preaching of Jesus followed. Still one task remains to be performed. In what does the unity of these three lines consist? I hope meanwhile that it is not necessary to point out that these are

not three lines which run parallel or which diverge, but rather three circles which coincide. True, these three circles are each of them drawn with entirely different materials —expectation of the kingdom of heaven, exposition of the law, and practical or proverbial wisdom; but they have the same center, the personality of Jesus, and they enclose the same space, human soul-life. Along those three lines and in each case Jesus permitted his own soul-life to stream forth into the soul-life of others. The material source of the light which penetrates from soul to soul is varied. But who concerns himself with the material source of the light while that light pours itself as a flood about him? What to us, in themselves, are presentation of the kingdom of heaven, exposition of the law, maxims of wisdom? Nothing! But they become all in all when through their oscillations the soul of Jesus comes into contact with ours. And that this might occur was the purpose of his mission and the content of his preaching.

---

We have reached the end. Is this irradiation of his own soul-life through the medium of the word, as Jesus accomplished it, religion

or is it something else? Possibly the question causes astonishment. But it is very old, as old as Christianity itself. The first accusations brought against the content of the preaching of Jesus, in the Roman-Greek world, alleged impiety and the annihilation of religion. Those who brought the charges had a delicate sense of what the preaching of Jesus was and signified. If religion is an aggregate of holy ceremonies, or a collection of laws, or a system of doctrine, or the disheartenment of human wisdom and experience, then is the preaching of Jesus the end of all religion, the death hour of which struck when he began to speak. But if religion is the soul-life of men which nourishes itself upon the divine soul-life, it follows that Jesus struck away from religion the unnatural fetters and bonds with which priests, politicians, legalists, and the worldly-wise had enchained it and ever seek to enchain it. Thus Jesus really disclosed what religion is, and his message becomes not a religion which stands beside or above other religions, but religion itself.

# Jesus As Personality

BY

HEAD MASTER H. SCHUSTER

## III

## JESUS AS PERSONALITY

When on a preceding evening the discussion concerned Jesus as teacher, it was said that, in order to comprehend thoroughly the apparently inconsistent expressions in the preaching of Jesus, it was necessary to hark back to the unitary spiritual consciousness out of which the words sprang. Out of the object of that evening's discussion—Jesus as teacher—issues naturally the object of this evening's concern—Jesus as personality.

And the question arises—is this in general a task within the range of accomplishment? Within the limits of the old dogma it is not. It is possible to describe the characteristics of a personality only when the personality is that of a man; one cannot describe the personality of a being who is God. A characterizing description of God is a conception both absurd and presumptuous. Consequently the theme of this evening involves the recognition of the

complete manhood of Jesus; and, further, the old ecclesiastical doctrine of the two natures of Jesus—as man and as God—is, so far as we are concerned, in quiescence. It is not for us to divide the one person of Jesus into two halves which exist side by side, and to discuss one of these halves with the prevision always that it is but one of the two, while the divine nature belongs to the whole being. Such a procedure was possible in a time which had not yet developed a firm scientific psychology; but for us such a "mental reservation," such a proviso, is not allowable.

And yet, there was, all unconsciously, in this crude psychology of the doctrine of two natures a true and significant thought. Every consideration of a great personality conducts us into abysses where our scientific measure cannot apply. Every ethical personality, to say nothing of the heroic and the prophetic, transcends time and the entanglements of cause and effect, rooting itself in the eternal. The deeds of a man, even of the greatest, are finite and incomplete; his thoughts, so far as they are expressed in words, as also his teachings, may be within reach, can be thought over again, perhaps may even be thought out and

their content completely exhausted. But what lies behind all these, the great personality itself, is full of mystery and of profound depths, inexhaustible, unfathomable. And so it is that the task of biography is in the case of a great personality one which is never fully accomplished. To take an example, are we really to believe that in Bielschowsky's Life of Goethe * we possess the final work on that subject? By no means, for even though no new sources should be discovered, the task of portraying the personality of Goethe would ever remain uncompleted; each generation would see in the portrait of this wonderful man new riches, new truth, new value.

If then in the portrayal of any character the scientific task is endless by its very nature, that is true in the case of Jesus in special measure. And there are two reasons for this, a subjective and an objective reason, one existing in the nature of the case and the other in ourselves. One difficulty lies in the sources. Our first three Gospels (and they alone come into consideration) speak to us only of the short period of the public activity of Jesus;

* A. Bielschowsky, *Goethe, sein Leben und seine Werke,* 2 vols., Munich, 1896-1905.

of the period of his development they report practically nothing. There is extant not a line from Jesus' own hand; there is available only the written fixation of the oral tradition of his words and deeds, set down quite late, about a generation after his death. And this tradition is derived from a community which worshipped Jesus as superhuman and exalted him to the heights of deity. If one is to draw a picture of the personality of Jesus, there is required, consequently, a very difficult investigation of the sources. Of course, such an investigation is out of the question here and now; I can only ask you to believe that the omissions or the affirmations over which you might wonder rest not upon frivolous conceits but upon mature and oft considered bases. The second difficulty lies in ourselves. Can a son furnish an objective characterization of the father whom he honors and loves? To be sure, an adequate representation cannot be drawn without the presence of love and admiration, which alone give what stands first and is most necessary—appreciation of the object. Nevertheless, for a scientific presentation there is required a certain aloofness and the cool temperament of sober criticism. And

what is the consequence? Not that others can more correctly portray Jesus than we who are his disciples, since without the religious feeling, such as his disciples possess, a prophet cannot be rightly appreciated. But we must concede that we are not in a position to furnish a scientifically competent characterization, we can only attempt a picture of the principal traits. This last is both needful and possible. It is needful, provided that the person is really of greater importance than his work and his words. The task is, moreover, possible. For the chief traits in the character of Jesus are in the first three Gospels marked out with sufficient clearness to the practiced eye. May it be our good fortune at this time rightly and effectually to point out these principal traits.

## I

We should at the outset briefly recall that Jesus was complete man, and also a child of his times and his nation. By this is not meant merely that he deeply loved his people, that he felt himself under a stress of duty that was owing to them, if indeed he did not conceive himself as limited to their service alone; we

intend to convey the idea that his spiritual method derived significant traits from the Jewish mind. Jewish-oriental in essence is the lively fancy with which Jesus portrays the future. Among the best certified words of Jesus is his utterance at the last supper: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. xxvi. 29). Thoroughly Jewish and utterly unhellenic is the paradox which comes out in the figurative language of Jesus, often highly exaggerated and passing far beyond the measure of what is distinctly possible. You may recall the saying about the beam in the eye, of the camel in the needle's eye, of the ten thousand talents which the servant owed to his master. Entirely Jewish also is the emotional, vivacious method of perception which takes in a matter at a single glance, and the unsystematic method of thought which proceeds from the basis furnished by such observations. It is an idle question whether Jesus, whose origins lay in Galilee, which was only half Jewish, had Aryan blood in his veins, as Chamberlain *

* Translator's Note. Possibly H. S. Chamberlain, *Arische Weltanschauung,* Berlin, 1905.

thinks he has proved. For this hypothesis there are no external proofs from the ethnological side. If psychology be taken into account, Jesus is surely to be reckoned a Jew, but with the reservation that he, like most great men, burst the narrow bounds of race and belonged to humanity at large.

Much more important and indeed more fruitful is the question concerning the general spiritual method of Jesus considered with reference to his temperament. There have been times—and these are not wholly past—when, both in literature and art, he has been set forth only as the passive sufferer, as the gentle and gracious, the man full of fervent, tender, yielding love, as the "lamb of God" and the "bridegroom of the soul." This representation is not only one-sided, it is directly false. While Jesus unquestionably had an insuperable ability to endure suffering and a wonderful might of love, these are but indications of his force, and force is the sum of his being. If we were to classify his genius under one of the four recognized temperaments, that genius would be called choleric; powerful, impetuous, royally-ruling emotion, incorruptible, insuperable, steel-tempered energy of will—

these are the qualities which sum up his being. This force reveals itself most instantaneously when he meets opposition. Let one read Matthew xxiii. with its chain of fulmination of woes against the scribes of Pharisees, who are described as hypocrites, blind leaders of the blind, whited sepulchres, and poisonous vipers! How like a swollen and foaming flood from a mountain torrent do these sentences pour forth upon his opponents, bringing heart anguish and driving the blood from its channels. But this man can not only rebuke and scorn, he can strike not only with the club, he wields a scintillating, biting blade which leaps forth with lightning quickness and with deadly certainty finds the joint in the opponent's armor. What a surpassing presence of mind and spiritual agility speaks forth in the verbal combats of his last days! One can hardly call Jesus a learned man, in spite of his profound knowledge of the Bible and of the exposition of the scribes; but he was more than that, he was a man full of mental and spiritual might and keenness.

A few examples may here be adduced from those last days. According to Matt. xix. 3 sqq., the Pharisees came to him with a delicate

question: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" The question was one which had produced a continuing debate between two schools of rabbis; one school allowed every minutia to be valid ground for divorce, the other would permit divorce for adultery alone. The problem now was—how would Jesus decide this "Either—or," with which school would he align himself? But, dear people, he goes with neither school, and his reply must surprise you: When God created man and woman, it was for union he created them; what therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder! The answer is, in general—no divorce at all, on grounds either great or small. But the opponents are not yet conquered; on the contrary, they suppose that Jesus has entrapped himself. Now they can put to him the malicious query —and with a misleading air of innocence is it advanced—"Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" Ah, but go softly! You triumph too soon, for he, with one stroke, hews through your snare and pierces you to the heart. "Oh, yes; Moses permitted it; do you not know why? Because of the hardness of your hearts.

But that is not the order in the creation of God; and even yet ye are not prepared for the great thoughts of God."

Nor did the Sadducees, the distinguished, rich, worldly priests, fare any better. These were people who were destitute of both warmth and force of soul. They had no faith, they could only make sport of the faith of other people. Could there be a finer object for their sport-making propensities than that newly risen belief, so dearly loved by the masses, in the resurrection of the body? They knew how crude a form this belief took among the people, how it was held that with flesh and bone, with skin and hair, the populace expected to arise from the grave. Now this superstition was certainly shared by that seducer of the people. So they said: Come now, let us make him the jest of the mob, let us impale him on the stake of laughter. And they came with their tale of the woman who was in succession the wife of seven husbands, and asked whose wife she was to be in the resurrection. Oh fie, ye weakhearted fools! With your blundering wits ye have dug a pit for yourselves. The Pharisees were able to return with a second assault, but ye are

undone at a stroke. With a single wave of the hand are ye shaken off. "Ye greatly err, for ye know nothing of the power of God, who creates something new, something beyond the horizon of your knowledge. When they arise, they will neither marry nor give in marriage, for they will be as the angels of God."

Still another example may be adduced in order to show how diversified his method was. Jesus had purified the temple, and the others had been compelled to submit, though they did so in impotent wrath and with gnashing of teeth. But they screw up their courage and put the question: "By what authority doest thou these things" (Matt. xxi. 23). But to this question no answer is vouchsafed! To be sure, there was not needed a moment for reflection in order to reply: "By the authority from the Divine which inheres in all prophets, by the authority with which Amos once burst into that brilliant festival of sacrifice at Bethel. You know the story, you read in Holy Scripture and know how to preach edifyingly upon it; you have canonized and mummified the story, so that it is no longer a living voice in your ears or a living form before your eyes." So he might have an-

swered, and in similar vein he had replied on another occasion (Matt. xxiii. 29 sqq.). But here he gave no reply; for this company an earnest answer which they could not understand would be sheer waste. Therefore in complete calmness—and what bespeaks more the consciousness of force than such a calm?—he put to them a question in return: "I will gladly answer you, but you must first answer a question for me. How was it with the baptism of John? Was it of divine authority or did it come by human presumption?" A tormenting question, a puzzled silence! "What shall we say? If we say: Of God, he will ask: Then why did ye not believe him? If we say: Of men, we have the people to fear, since with them John has the rank of a prophet since that creature Herod beheaded him. What shall we say?" And what did they say? Why, what but that emptiest of answers: "We do not know." And can we not see the scorn on the lip of Jesus as he retorts: "Ye do not know! Well, then, neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things."

If in this story there emerges a deliberate irony as one of the weapons of Jesus in his

contests, it is not a solitary instance, for this form appears elsewhere. Thus: "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance" (cf. Luke xv. 7, 10). Did Jesus really mean that the merciless Pharisees, against whom the saying was coined, were righteous people who did not need repentance? Moreover, with irony is connected humor. Recall the parable of the supper that was declined. "I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them. . . . I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come" (Luke xiv. 19-29). Far more vigorous, but also more bitter, is the humor which comes out in another passage that is less familiar. The "dear public," as Luther jestingly named it, is not contented with its prophets. John (the Baptist) was a gloomy ascetic who neither ate nor drank, and he certainly had a bad devil; then there came the Son of Man who ate and drank like other people, and, pshaw! how commonplace! "He is a glutton and a drunkard, a sinner and companion of publicans." This is the report of Jesus, and now comes his opinion: "Where-

unto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the streets who fall into dispute over their games. One party makes a play and the others do not join in, and so they begin to make reproaches: 'We wanted to play at marriage with you and piped for you, but you would not dance; then we would have played at a funeral, and mourned for you, but you would not weep.' Who can do the right thing for such children?" (Matt. xi. 16 sqq.).

Irony and humor are two of the most significant signs of a spontaneous, easy superiority. And this quality manifests itself in act as well as in word. Mention has already been made of the purification of the Temple. This was an unusually bold act. What made it possible for this layman with his twelve disciples to take control of the Temple enclosure in spite of the host of priests, Levites, and the whole police force of the Temple? Such a result was possible only because the royal will of Jesus bore along with it the mass of the people. It set in motion an irresistible avalanche; and this was the cause of the fury and the terror of the rebuked priesthood, and of the secret, nocturnal treachery by means of

which alone they proceeded to apprehend him.

Of this power of Jesus over the people the Gospels furnish repeated descriptions which show the never ending wonder. It is quite clear that in this matter legend has had its play, as for example in the story of the miraculous feeding. But even this narrative presents in distorted form a real trait of Jesus' greatness. The impression made upon the people, as reflected in the traditions embodied in the Gospels, seems to have gained its strength from two particulars—his preaching and his works of healing. He preached mightily and not as the scribes. These dabbled and fussed with the letter, they tormented and pressed the tradition. But Jesus spoke out forcibly, with the living word, as one who carried authority; no foreign law bound him in its meshes, he created all from his own breast. He even, when occasion arose, with unexampled boldness set his single person against the entire sacred past: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, . . . but I say unto you"—so run the turns throughout in the exposition of the law in the Sermon on the Mount. Is not in

this the word of the psalmist fulfilled: "Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." But it was not the choice of Jesus to be dashing in pieces, healing was his delight. And after we have abstracted from the accounts whatever a grateful and wonder-seeking generation has added, there remains ever the picture of a man of singular energy of soul, of mysterious nervous power, who could so act upon other weak but trusting souls and organisms as to bring from the very center of their beings the stimulus to health. Especially in the case of those most unfortunate of all unfortunates, the deranged and mentally ill, who then by all the world, and even by themselves, were regarded as "possessed," did the saving might of this gladsome victorious personality manifest itself.

But the most marvelous of results is that which he wrought in his disciples. We pass by the fascinating power of attraction by which he drew these people to himself, so that they renounced house and calling and wife and relations in order that they might follow him who had not even where he might lay his head. We have in mind, above all, that miraculous power with which he bound to him-

self these men beyond and after his death—the infamous death of a malefactor. Here is truly a wonderful might, so far beyond the power of conception that it was believed possible to explain it only by means of physical appearances and of instruction received from him as risen from the dead. If for us this naive method of accounting for the fact is no longer possible, there remains as explanation nothing but the continued operation of the power of Jesus which he had in life, accounting for the courage and the inspiration in consequence of which the disciples saw their exalted Lord in ecstasy and through which they became witnesses courageous even to death. But then, indeed, the power of this personality rises first into regions of incomprehensible majesty.

But of the nature of this power the best has not yet been said. While the force of a mountain torrent is most evident to the senses as it foams and boils among the rocks and boulders, to the thoughtful observer it reveals itself as mightier when in ordered and measured flow it passes the millrace and releases a thousand new forces. Similarly in the case before us; the power of Jesus in conflict is signifi-

cant, and when it was needful to employ that power in this way, he did not scruple so to do. But it was not because he preferred this use. He was most fond of comparing his activity with the inoffensive and beneficent work of the sower. And was he not the sower par excellence, and is not the seed he cast still growing, even in places where its increase is not noted or is even denied? There is hardly anything more characteristic of the entire method of Jesus than that his whole desire and effort were directed to the creation of positive value. In spite of the radical opposition to him, because of which he had to deal at close quarters with what was mouldering and untrue, Jesus was nothing less than a critic and enlightener. In general, he did not content himself with pronouncing everything false as false and proving it to be such; his passion was for sowing and building, creating and stimulating others to create. He was in the ranks of men whose work of criticism is carried on with the desire to install good in place of evil, the true in place of what is false; and he had a glorious faith that the good would carry its own evidence of value and must of itself gain the victory. Like all great spirits, like a Luther

or a Goethe or a Bismarck, Jesus was fundamentally conservative—if by "conservative" we understand the disposition that still has confidence in the past and does not regard itself alone as wise, that retains an abundance of piety and reverence, and that above all loves what has true value even though it be hoary with age. "A teacher who is really ready for the kingdom of God is like a housekeeper who brings forth from his stores both old and new."

If I were to illustrate fully this deliverance concerning the conservative, productive method of Jesus, I should have to reproduce the whole of the preceding lecture. For it shows how Jesus had introduced a creative fullness of new great thoughts within the integuments of old forms. Do you recall that story of the Sibylline Books at Rome? The narrative tells how to a legendary king of Rome there came an aged woman who urged him to buy nine prophetic books; but the king thought the price too high and dismissed the woman. She came to him a second time, having, meanwhile, burned three of the books, and offered the remaining six at the original price. When she was again dismissed, she

burnt three more, but even then demanded for the three remaining the same sum as for the original nine. The king was astounded at her persistence and resolution, and paid the price. Thenceforth in every need these holy books were consulted, and upon them depended Rome's power. Is not the case we are discussing similar? How few of the words of Jesus have come down to us, but how mighty is their operation, and still their influence spreads and deepens. What is there in the world comparable to this carpenter's might? Is this mere chance, or is it proof positive of the creative power which was enclosed in his personality?

## II

In complete naturalness and correspondence with this mighty force there existed a strong and even superhuman self-reliance. This quality has already been before us in the preceding discussion and with great significance. In order to represent to ourselves this royal self-consciousness we need but to recall that phrase: "But I say unto you." Not at all inconsistent with this self-reliance are the testimonies to the condescension of Jesus to

the small and lowly, and this is true of his well-known saying: "for I am meek and lowly of heart." Indeed the contrary is the case; for it is only where a stronger and nobler stoops to condescension that one can find true meekness. The weakness of the weak is no virtue.

Even though it be by chance, there is yet to be seen a profound significance in the fact that the Evangelist Matthew (xi. 27 sqq.) unites with the words of Jesus respecting his meekness those words expressing the most exalted self-reliance: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: . . . neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." There is manifested here, as in the setting up of his words over against the Old Testament, the consciousness of a last and conclusive revelation from God. He completes the old age and introduces a new one.

But the particular thought which comes to expression in such words is Jesus' consciousness of messiahship. Here we touch upon a difficult and much debated problem. A recently deceased theologian of brilliant critical power and most scrupulous thoroughness ad-

vanced in a learned book the thesis that in general Jesus never designated himself as Messiah, and that the reports to that effect were importations into the tradition having their origin in the faith of the primitive Christian communities. This theory may now be regarded as wholly untenable. It is practically beyond doubt that Jesus felt that he was the Messiah and that at times he so expressed himself. And this fact should not surprise us, after a sober consideration. Since he had the assurance that to his people he was bringing the final and conclusive word of God, that he was more than one of the prophets—more, for example, than John the Baptist—what form of expression would this self-consciousness be more likely to take than the old form of the thought of the Messiah, so familiar to his people? Granted that this form lacked comprehensiveness and fitted ill the tremendous content which it had to bear, it is to be remembered that the same is true of the idea of the kingdom of God—concerning which one of the former lectures treats—and that it does not coincide wholly with the message of Jesus. But if Jesus was man, entire man, if he was a pious Jew who loved his

people and had grown up with the Holy Scriptures of that people, is it not perfectly natural that without special determination he should relate to himself the old idea of a king, anointed by God and the Holy Spirit, who was to bring to his people the golden age in the kingdom of God? Yet he had not reflected much upon this; he had not formulated for himself a theory of it. His interest lay not in the person or in the significance of the idea; he was concerned with the mission which was entrusted to him, to rouse his people and prepare them for the coming kingdom of God. So it appears that at the beginning, while he was engaged in a fruitful and victorious activity and a fair success made no especial reflection necessary, only seldom did the thought flash forth in him that he was chosen of God to become king in the kingdom of God and the Messiah of his people. Only towards the end of his life, when opposition to him grew and he foresaw that collision was inevitable and then external defeat, does it seem that he really took up into his consciousness the Messiah idea as related to himself, and particularly that form of it which is found in the Book of Daniel: the Messiah

was to come on the clouds of heaven and was to set up the eternal kingdom of God.

With this thought that he was to return after death in messianic lordship he was able to confirm faith in his mission. But even yet it must not be assumed that he had formulated any definite theory, that there was already created the doctrine of a suffering and exalted Messiah. Least of all may we assume that Jesus was conscious of the distinction between his own idea of messiahship and the crude nationalistic conception of it which was current among the masses, and that he shrewdly said to himself: If you avow yourself as the Messiah before the people, they will immediately think of a worldly king who is to break the yoke of the Romans, while your thought is that of a king of hearts; therefore, as a principle of pedagogic wisdom, keep your messiahship concealed from the masses of the people and take care that it be brought home, with a correct conception of it, only to the inner circle of the disciples. Such a popular and normal method of considering the subject is altogether too refined and subtle for Jesus to have followed, and it contradicts the noble and naive originality of his nature. He did

not live in a world of reflection and self-contemplation, he lived entirely in his work. We may say that the Messiah idea was only a make-shift. He instinctively perceived how little this old theory contained which was in harmony with his own being and will. And so—that is, not because of a calculated pedagogical aim—he held aloof from the Messiah idea as long as he could, though without definite intention of so doing; then, toward the end of his life, when anxiety for the issue and condition of his work beset his soul, he seized upon this idea as one which possessed the requisite firmness and security. With the thought of the Prophet Daniel's Son of Man, who was to return, he saved faith in his divine mission, he preserved faith in himself and his work. Thus the messianic faith of Jesus is by no means to be explained away from a historical point of view, but it is not to be regarded as really essential. The personality and the preaching of Jesus can be set forth in its permanently worthful essentials without touching upon the problem of his messiahship at all.

With the foregoing, considerable contributions are made to the correct understanding

of the question whether the mental processes of Jesus were normal and sound. To laymen it will, perhaps, seem astonishing that such a question is raised at all; and yet, it is not altogether arbitrarily that the matter has come up. As suggesting it, reference has been made not only to the superhuman self-reliance which is in evidence in the messianic declaration, but also to the many series of highly emotional excitements which come to light so frequently in the preaching and healing activities of Jesus. Not only did his eager opponents raise the cry that he drove out devils by the aid of Beelzebub, the chief of the devils; even his own relations, mother and brethren, regarded him as out of his senses and would have taken him forcibly to his home while he was engaged in teaching. The direction of Jesus' activity was certainly often uncommon and startling, and exceedingly great mental exertions recorded themselves in elementary outbreaks of emotion, such as the cleansing of the Temple. If Jesus were to be estimated by an average of present day preachers and teachers, he would appear to be an inconceivable phenomenon; but, then, who would dare assert that we should measure a

great genius by the average drawn from ordinary quiet citizens? In profound sympathy with the greatness of genius Conrad Ferdinand Meyer has said of Luther: "His mind is the battlefield of two ages; I do not wonder at all that he sees demons." How would the young Goethe and Bismarck appear if they were to be measured by the standard of ordinary pikemen? Would they appear mentally unsound, psychopathic? Then the question resolves itself into logomachy. Of course the mental life and the external performances are "unnormal," but the question is whether they are subnormal or supernormal. It would not be worth while long to dwell upon this question were it not that it gives us welcome occasion to bring into the foreground the saneness and compact harmony of the mentality of Jesus.

Already there has been occasion to remark how unstudied, how naive in the best sense of the word, the genius of Jesus is. He makes the same impression upon us as is made by an unspoiled and magnificent scene in nature; he is mighty and, at times, terrible, like nature at large, but withal clear, simple, restful, serene, and sure of himself. In Jesus there is

nothing of self-examination, self-observation, self-analysis—those processes of which the modern man is so fond. His genius is through and through virile, forceful, simple, true, objective. His objectivity is that of the great epic poet who tolerates nothing but a clear and true reflection of nature and men. This will become entirely obvious if, with quiet and collected mind, we contemplate the parables of Jesus. Are they not in fact an unblurred and undimmed reflection in which can be seen the entire broad activity of his period, the growing of the flowers, the life of animals, the doings of men whose sphere of life ranges from the hut to the palace, all of which may be recognized as portrayed with wonderful fidelity and distinctness? This will perhaps become yet clearer to us if we compare Jesus with genius of quite another character. Note, for instance, how intricate and artificial is the course of thought and method of proof employed by the rabbis, the theologians of the time, and how refreshingly sound, on the other hand, is the intuition of Jesus. In the last lecture there were brought strikingly before us the logical element, the trait

of lucid rationality, the evident independence in the thought of Jesus. It is worth while to dwell a moment on this, since in it there is found one of the most significant proofs of the truth and soundness of his mental genius. You will recall the story already rehearsed in which the Pharisees brought against Jesus the charge of being in league with the devil. Much as they wished it, they could not deny the power which he had over the evil spirits, by which the people of that time supposed the unfortunate insane to be possessed. But they were unwilling to permit this undeniable fact to pass for what it actually was as seen by the uncorrupted mind, that is, for proof of Jesus' equipment with the Spirit of God. Consequently they excogitated the quaint theory that the prince of the devils assisted him in driving out the demons! To this there must be added what is implied in the charge of the Pharisees, i. e., that it was through such specious demonstrations that he was able to seduce the hearts of the people. But this finely spun theory was torn to shreds by Jesus with firm hand when he simply appealed to the people's natural common sense: How can it

be that one devil drive another out? A kingdom that is divided against itself falls apart (cf. Matt. xii. 22-30).

Or it is possible to compare Jesus with two men who were in close relations with him, who were his disciples and scholars—Paul and Augustine. Towards Paul especially we all have, I hope, a feeling of profound admiration, and in many respects doubtless we are conscious of a relationship to him—more so than of a relationship to Jesus. For his struggling, fighting, brooding, provident, yearning genius, his passionate eagerness for the end which floated before his mind's eye, make him more flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood than the corresponding qualities in the entire unswerving purity and assurance of the being of Jesus. Yet, do we not at times gather the impression from Paul that his nervous and excitable genius causes in him a heat and an exaggeration beyond the normal; that now and again, of course with entire subjective honesty, he overstresses and builds theories which so far resemble those constructed by the general mass of men who have not passed through the crucible of conversion, that they are not able to stand before the trying fire of

simple verity? An impression similar to this is made, only much deeper, by Augustine. Is not the disposition which he portrays in his confessions as his during his youth at times thoroughly unsound? Or are we not to take as earnest the reproaches he brings against himself to the effect that as an infant at the breast of his nurse he fought against giving nourishment to his foster-brother?* Is not this the air from a hothouse blowing strong upon us? On the contrary, when we come into the companionship of Jesus, we breathe at once the pure and fresh air of nature and truth. He knew well how weak, and even at times evil, are the children of men, but he never felt the necessity arising in some theory, to falsify fact by exaggeration. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children"—so at one time runs his deliverance, and by it he briefly and strikingly outlines man's being as it really is, a mixture of good and bad. In his preaching he issues a call to repentance, to a change in character; but he never makes this change to be a pure

* Translator's Note. *Confessions,* I., ix.11; Eng. transl. in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 2 ser., i. 48, New York, 1892.

miracle which arises in the grace of God, as do later dogmaticians; quite the reverse, since he reveals a beautiful confidence in the nature of man as created by God and possessing a will to do good, and then makes appeal to that will.

This sense of reality and of verity in Jesus exhibits an innate repugnance to all religious unveracity. There was nothing against which Jesus more passionately fought or which he hated more than every kind of religious hypocrisy. And this hate was no less evident when hypocrisy existed in its most refined form and hid itself so as not to be detected by most men. Who were the opponents against whom he was ever thrusting? The Pharisees. But they were not all clumsy and conscious hypocrites; on the contrary, that type had but few representatives among them. Still, they were in immediate danger of that which menaces all religion, especially all ecclesiastical religion, namely the danger of not marking the difference between an ideal which was a creature of the will, imagined, carried about for exhibition, and the reality of their own performances, together with the danger of exchanging pious forms of one sort

or another for the essence of piety. A fact which may be established in these times by various examples is that the more ecclesiastical in type piety is, the greater danger there is of the lie or the half-lie. "It is a miracle if a priest be saved" is a saying ascribed to Chrysostom. Every station has its own inherent dangers, and hypocrisy is the fundamental menace which assails the religious condition. Jesus recognized this and fought it with unrelenting pertinacity. This sense of reality and truth is a most beautiful confirmation of his own saying, that the disciple is not above his master, and is proof positive of our affirmation of the soundness of his being.

A quality of this soundness of Jesus may be pointed out in what we may call the Hellenic serenity of his mind. Can we not find in his mental make-up a characteristic trace of that beautiful, distinctive, joyous serenity which plays around the mouth of the divine Plato as represented in a certain celebrated antique bust? The man who composed the diversified parables, whose eyes rested with delight upon the lilies of the field and the birds of the heavens, who laid his hand in blessing upon the heads of little children, who submitted to

anointing at the hands of woman, who refused for his disciples the demand that they fast on the ground that fasting at the marriage festival is untimely—and the days of association with him were days of joy like those of the marriage season—he possessed in reality a large share of the serenity of soul which depends upon complete inner harmony. We do not forget that there were times of inner stress and storm. And in saying this we have in mind not merely the history of the temptation, nor the prayer and struggle in Gethsemane, we think above all of that significant saying reported to us by Luke (xii. 49-50): "I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" In this we look upon a mighty agitation, upon the holy impatience of a soul in fight and tribulation in behalf of the kingdom of God. However, taken as a whole the impression Jesus' life makes is that of a totality of peace, a final and conclusive power. His soul life was like the ocean, the surface of which is at times tossed and stormy, but its unmeasured depths remain in unruffled calm.

## III

An American scholar who has rendered great service in the investigation of the psychology of religion,* in the book in which he describes the variety of religious experiences, makes a distinction between natures which are "once-born" and those which are "twice-born." By the latter he means the natures of those men who have lived through a distinct (psychological) break and who through conversion, a sort of rebirth, have attained to their religious faith. Men who have not experienced such a break, but have developed gradually and uninterruptedly into a condition of firm religious belief, are said to belong to the once-born. This American has a very distinct liking for the twice-born and is of the opinion that the great geniuses in the religious realm belong to this class. In this he is

* Translator's Note. W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience,* New York, 1902; cf. pp. 80, 166, 363, 488, for references to "once-born" and "twice-born" men.

not wholly astray, and can call as evidence of his contention the names of such men as Paul, Augustine, Francis of Assisi, Luther, and many others. Yet I must observe that he overlooks, for instance, a Schleiermacher and a Zwingli, who do not belong to this class. If we apply this classification to Jesus, all that we know of him shows that he belonged in the category of once-born. Even though he did submit to the baptism by John, which he as a pious Jew regarded as a divine ordinance, and even though through this he received the impulse to his own public ministry, yet all the evidence bears against the supposition that his baptism had the significance of a break or of conversion. It is no new discovery, has long ago been made the subject of remark, that in the words of Jesus there is never the lightest trace of a scar which indicates an old wound of the soul. How entirely different is it with Paul—to select a conspicuous example. Many years after his conversion, near Damascus, long after he had become the most fruitful of missionaries and had many times over made good the losses which he had caused the community by his persecution, the scar of this old wound still burned so severely that he doubted

whether he was worthy to bear the name of apostle [I Cor. xv. 9].

You will notice that we have already passed from the question of the soundness and harmony of the soul-life of Jesus to the question of his sinlessness. It is an old conviction of Christianity, which appears many times as early as in the New Testament, that Jesus was the one among all men who was unconditionally sinless. Does this question permit of an answer? At any rate it is not answered by reference to the saying reported in the Fourth Gospel: "Which of you convinceth me of sin" (John viii. 46). For outside of the fact that the Evangelist John, so far as we can see, is continually putting his own words and thoughts into the mouth of Jesus and therefore is not competent as a historical witness, a remark of the kind just cited naturally of itself carries no force of conviction. However, we were justified in saying, as we have, that among the numerous affirmations of Jesus there is not one which bears a trace of recollection of past sins. No conclusion follows on this point from consideration of the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer, for there is no proof that Jesus ever employed it himself in

the way of seeking forgiveness for guilt. But if the question be whether Jesus claimed sinlessness as a quality, as the Fourth Gospel describes, our answer is that we can hardly believe it. For while he had a lively consciousness of a gap between himself and most men (we may cite once more the saying: "Ye, then, being evil" Matt. vii. 11), his perceptions told him also in as emphatic form of a gap between himself and God. A young man addressed him as "Good master"—in Hebrew the expression is practically equivalent to "perfect" or "absolute"—and he declined the attribute with the words: "No one is good, but God alone." In the reverence which he regarded as due to God alone and in his humility he would not permit a predicate to be applied to him which belonged to God only. And yet he could himself instruct his disciples: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. v. 48).

Shall we then affirm that he was sinful as we are? Surely not. But it seems to us that the question is falsely phrased. What we must ask about is not the sinlessness of Jesus, but his ethical perfection; we must apply not a nega-

tive norm but a positive. The problem of the sinlessness of Jesus has its basis in a narrow-minded and Pharisaic point of view. A distinguished scholar has aptly and in brief form described the method—or rather lack of method—of the Pharisees in the statement: "Not to do good was their ideal, but to escape sin." The aim of Jesus was altogether different. In looking at men he was not in search of their faults, for he knew that none was faultless, but he sought for their excellences and decided according to the good that he found in them. "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them" (Matt. vii. 12), and "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (Matt. xxv. 40) are the norms according to which decision is to be given at the final judgment. Perfection—that is what the question amounts to; did Jesus claim perfection? But we have seen that Jesus expressly refused this predicate. How could a man who narrated to his disciples the story of his temptation, who passionately prayed in Gethsemane for voluntary resignation to God's will, describe himself as perfect? But when

we find a man with whom we dare not at all compare ourselves exhibiting such humility, shall we not in silent admiration revere him as possessing in this quality the most exalted of his perfections.

And so we can afford to dismiss the old vexed question of the sinlessness of Jesus, and may apply ourselves to a problem which springs out of that, in itself attractive and also productive of unusual compensation; we may describe the inner freedom of Jesus on its various sides. The root of this freedom is ethical self-conquest. The inner freedom of Jesus is first of all ethical, that is, the freedom of a will which is regulated by the purposes of God and is supreme above the claims of the lower nature. That this lower nature made claims, imperious claims, is certainly indicated by such deliverance as: "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell" (Matt. v. 29); such a saying indicates one who has experienced the claims of an earthly nature in his own person, but also one who with a stronger will has overcome the stormy will of

besetting passions. It is the declaration of a man who has bound the strong man and taken his weapons away. So that there is presented to us a victor who teaches us, in the exposition of the law which is contained in the Sermon on the Mount, the completed ethics of a moral disposition. Forth from the bitter root of a relentless severity toward himself he has made to grow the beautiful flower of freedom; and from this stock we see issuing ever new riches of bloom and fruit.

In his feelings Jesus was originally thoroughly a Jew. The Gospel of Matthew (x. 5-6) reports a saying of Jesus in which he directed his disciples: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." It is altogether possible that this saying is genuine, and that the Jesus who later adduced as examples worthy of imitation the faith of the Roman captain and the charity of the Samaritan was at first under the limitations of the inborn prejudice in favor of his own people. We are in possession of a narrative in which, according to the most probable interpretation, it is possible to see how Jesus overcame this na-

tional prejudice. It is the well-known story of the Canaanitish woman (Matt. xv. 21 sqq.). You remember that Jesus at first refused the help sought by the woman for her sick daughter: "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs." But to this there came the reply: "Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table." Thereupon Jesus yielded: "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt." As usually explained, this story is an example of the Christic method of teaching; he was intent upon trying the woman's humility and faith. To me such a method of teaching, dangerous as it is, does not commend itself; it is more natural and more delicate to take the story as it reads; Jesus permitted himself to be persuaded by the faith of mother love! That he needed to be persuaded, that a national prejudice was there which had to be laid aside, entirely accord with the temper of the Jews of that period. And the true greatness revealed in this story is just this, that the hard shell of national prejudice was burst apart by the voice of humanity. We may be permitted here a comparison. If Luther, at Marburg,

had brought himself to the point where he could lay aside his old prejudice against the Swiss (whom he regarded as "fanatics" like the Anabaptists), and had been persuaded to take the hand of brotherhood there offered, how different, at any rate as men see it, would have been the course of the Reformation and of the German people! Here at least is exemplified the axiom that a disciple is not greater than his master.

For the development of religion the disconnection of Jesus from this spirit of narrow nationality is of great significance, for only in that way could Christianity arise out of Judaism; but for an estimate of his personal value much more important is his relation to the religious traditions of his people, to the official cult and to the law. The Gospel by Luke reports for us the well-known episode of Jesus in his twelfth year visiting the Temple and there uttering the characteristic saying: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" From a historical point of view this saying may be questioned; but it belongs to that class of utterances which carry a typical verity. As a pious Jew Jesus clung with reverential love to the sanctuary of his peo-

ple; under the spur of inspiration he once undertook the cleansing of the Temple, and out of noble wrath spoke the accents of an ardent love. Nor did he despise the service of sacrifice. To be sure, he cited from the prophet Hosea the lovely dictum that mercy is better than sacrifice (cf. Matt. ix. 13). But in the Sermon on the Mount he gave the following admonition: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother"; and he immediately continues: "and then come and offer thy gift." (Matt. v. 23-24). It must be granted that he combatted Pharisaic religiosity, which fulfilled with exaggerated pedantry the external legalistic duties, tithing mint, anise, and cummin; and he insisted upon the duty of doing the real will of God in works of righteousness, mercy, and truth; but he continued with the injunction: "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone" (Matt. xxiii. 23). We have already remarked that Jesus was essentially of a conservative nature, full of piety and veneration; he was no radical innovator or revolutionary.

Where the old was no hindrance, where in it he found aught of blessing, he let it stand unassailed. It was only where through attention to cultus and law the fundamental commands of God were broken, when these were seized upon to hinder him—as, for example, when men tried to prevent his healing on the sabbath—that with a sovereign power of perfectness he set himself without concern above all commands, whether they arose in the tradition of the scribes or came from the Old Testament itself. It never came into his consciousness that he hereby cut at the very roots of cultus and law; he had come not to destroy but to fulfill. This position, which seems externally to be fundamentally opposed to the traditional religious plan of life of his people, is no evidence of a weakness that is without principle; it rather announces an inner freedom which is without limits. By disposition he stood wholly above mere things; he needed no theory of the passing of the law, and he had no need to spend himself in conflict with the law. His method, to live and to work, is in its inner essence so unlegalistic, so limited only by reverence for God and love to men that he did not think at all of law, and so

lived entirely untroubled, in accordance with the commonplace ordinances of the law—for these were the customary and the usual among his people and in his youth.

How precious a thing is that inner freedom, the character of which is that its possessor is wholly uncompromised either by old prejudices or by novelties of doctrine: a freedom by which he possesses liberty—not after the manner imparted by an unintelligent and fanatical rationalism which presents only a caricature of liberty and, in fact, makes him a slave to its theories, but—in the sense of that just freedom which seeks and loves the good wherever it is to be found; a freedom which is not acquired by obstinacy or by convulsive effort, or must ever obtrude itself even to the degree of offensiveness, because otherwise it cannot maintain its own faith in itself; a freedom which, contrary to that last described, possesses an assurance founded in serenity because of which it can easily dispense with external expression. In order to obtain an example of this royal freedom for purposes of comparison it is necessary once more to have recourse to Luther. That is a really precious

letter which he indited to Buchholzer, provost of Berlin, when the latter made objection arising in scruples of conscience over the use of ecclesiastical vestments and processions which the Elector Joachim wished to retain in accordance with his cautious method of introducing the Reformation: "Provided your master will permit you to preach the Gospel more effectively and to administer both sacraments according to the institution of Christ, in God's name go with him and carry a silver or a golden cross or wear an ecclesiastical hat or cape, of whatever material it may be made. And if your master is not satisfied with one hat or cape, then put three of them on, just as Aaron the high priest put on three coats, one over the other. And if he is not content with one circuit or procession that you make with accompaniment of bells and singing, then go seven times around, just as Joshua did with the Children of Israel at Jericho." It does not concern us here to discuss the practicality of this advice with reference to the future development of the Church. We are here regarding the personality, and it must give us exceeding great joy

to recognize in this saying of Luther the great, broad, free method in accordance with which Jesus looked at things.

In connection with this matter of inner freedom belongs the much debated problem of the position of Jesus with reference to asceticism. The question may be put in this form: Was Jesus an ascetic and the spiritual father of the later monasticism? Or was his type of piety that of a Luther, which belonged in the world and took delight in it? Jesus was unmarried, had no house and no possessions, often encouraged a like scorn of these things in his disciples, and at times gave impressive warning of the danger of riches. But he none the less accepted the hospitality of rich men, even of taxgatherers, the capitalists of the period and men in the service of the Romans, he blessed children, and had women among his followers. From these two points of view, to some, even of our contemporaries, he appears as a gloomy ascetic; but by some of his contemporaries he was scolded because he was "gluttonous, and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners" (Matt. xi. 19). What shall be our decision in this matter? At any rate, not that much-loved phrase: "The truth lies

midway." The truth does not lie there in this case (indeed, seldom is that its position), it lies far above the level of those contrary opinions. The one side takes particular account of Jesus' exceedingly earnest sense of reality, through which he recognized the danger of wealth, and of the thorough-going self-denial with which he put his whole personality at the service of his calling. The other side misconstrues the stability of his inner freedom, won by means of the sternest self-discipline, and forgets that through this stability he could dare things before which an excellent [but lower] form of piety must shrink. Or, was it not a terrible thing that Jesus should turn with preference to the lawless stratum of the people, that he did not shun association with publicans and harlots? You do not forget the story of the woman who was a great sinner. Jesus was at table with a distinguished Pharisee. There came up from behind a woman who was known in the city as a harlot, whose purpose was to prove her gratitude to the Master, who had received her, by kissing his feet and anointing him. How maliciously glitter the eyes of the fine table companions, how busily pious are these compan-

ions as they chatter to each other in whispers: "This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is, and would not have permitted it" (cf. Luke vii. 39). He knew better than did the others who it was that touched him—a sinner, a great sinner, certainly, but a soul that had changed its course, that was seeking God and what was good! Who might hold aloof from her? Is it not fact that the sick need the physician, and not the well?

## IV

It was this inner freedom which made possible such intercourse with those proscribed by society. But this freedom is not the impelling cause to such a course of conduct; it has already been remarked that Jesus did not belong to the half-free who must at any price manifest their freedom externally and strikingly. The impelling cause was nothing else than love. And with this we come to the portrayal of the traits which rightly have ever been regarded as the crown in the picture of Jesus, but can be seen in their fullest glory only when they are viewed with his force forming the background. The love of a weak-

ling may often be touching, but that of the strong grips and overpowers. Truly boundless is the love of Jesus; it makes no halts before the hedges which a narrow conscience impels the pious [of a certain class] to rear. It, like all real love, seeks not its own, but ever the welfare of another, and consequently it turns in its application to those who most need it—those exposed to danger physical or ethical. To those who were in physical need, to the sick, Jesus turned with merciful help and healing; he did not perform works of healing that he might work miracles and so arouse faith. On the contrary, he declined with brusque severity to perform signs and wonders: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. . . . If they hear not them, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead" (Luke xvi. 29-31). The entire and rich work of healing wrought by Jesus comes well under the heading: "He was moved with compassion for the people" (cf. Mark vi. 34).

Jesus differed from those who possess a hyperspiritual religiosity in that he did not regard or neglect the physical as of no account; but, of course, his especial concern was for lost

souls. His calling was to win souls for the kingdom of God, and the love with which he followed his calling was, in accordance with his very constitution, practically boundless. Nothing is lost which will let itself be saved. In the justly celebrated yet seldom fully grasped parable of the prodigal son, this limitless love finds wonderfully vivid expression. Is it not a love that is measureless, overabounding, untrammelled by pedagogical limitations, which the father brings as he comes to meet his lost son? He does not wait to hear his story, does not listen to his confession, does not even stop to convince himself that the repentance of the son is genuine and likely to endure. For all of this there is no time; his heart is filled with love and with joy because he has once more the son who was lost and was even believed to be dead. How petty, how poor, in comparison is the love and the forgiveness in the exercise of which the pious often think that they are accomplishing something great and good! But in this limitless love of Jesus there is nothing soft or sentimental; it is at times almost austere and bitter. How impressively rings out in the story of the adulterous woman the brusque sentence

with which he dismisses her: "Go, and sin no more" (John viii. 11). And how severe are the demands which he makes upon the easily stirred, light-hearted, though excellent disciples when they would follow him! To the one who would first say farewell to his family he said: "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God" (Luke ix. 32). Another, however, with whom his riches were too important a thing, notwithstanding other excellences, he commanded: "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, . . . and come and follow me" (Matt. xix. 21). And of this youth it is said that "Jesus beholding him loved him" (Mark x. 21).

Once more, how delicate and tender, how full of understanding of human individuality, is this great yet austere love. Is there anything finer in the Gospels than the exceedingly unostentatious narrative of the anointing of Jesus in Bethany? There was a woman who loved and admired Jesus, and she was under the necessity of doing something to relieve her heart of its burden of love. And so she emptied on the head of Jesus a vessel of precious ointment, the costliest that she had,

which she had brought for the purpose. "What extravagance!" murmur the disciples; "this ointment might have been sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor." Certainly, that might have been done. And if Jesus had been asked in advance whether this homage were right, he would probably have answered along that line. But the thing was done and could not be changed. That it happened to himself made no difference; but may not the needs of the heart claim their rights? Shall the joy of that woman, who knew no other way of satisfying her affection, be taken away after the deed was done? Jesus is not the man to blame that which was prompted by childlike innocence of heart. So he takes the woman under his protection against the paltry calculation of the disciples: "Let her alone, why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. For ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will ye can do them good; but me ye have not always" (Mark xiv. 6-7). At no time does Jesus seem greater to me than under this testimony to his genuine manhood.

Finally, this love is thoroughly ethical in its nature. By this is meant that it is not regu-

lated by calamity, or sympathy, or antipathy, or by the ties of blood, or by individual necessities, but, like all love of the highest type, by regard for the real well-being of another. It has already been said that the life of Jesus exhibited the influence of a strong natural feeling. The man who blessed little children, designated marriage as a union ordained of God which might not be dissolved, and in his parables portrayed often the happenings of family life, was certainly bound to his own people by the ties of natural affection. And yet, when mother and brothers and sisters would hinder his work, he cut loose from them with the austere saying: "Who are my mother and sister and brother? They who do the will of God." A feeling of natural sympathy connected him especially with three of his disciples, Peter, John and James, who were his nearest confidants. They were with him during the severest crisis of his life, during his period of prayer in Gethsemane; and at that moment there fell from his lips that penetratingly touching word of yearning for human companionship: "Could ye not watch with me one hour?" (Matt. xxvi. 40). And yet he would not show impartiality even

to these three. When John and James came to him with the request that they might hold the places of honor at his right and his left when he came into his kingdom, he repelled the covetousness of the request with the words: "The cup that I drink ye shall drink, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized; but the places on my right and my left is for them for whom it hath been prepared—by God alone" (cf. Matt. xx. 23; Luke xviii. 39-40). And when Peter, with a human weakness that is easily conceivable and in well-meant solicitude, would have Jesus take care of himself and avoid the course that led to the momentous conflict, he was repelled with the severe rebuke: "Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men" (Mark viii. 33).

In this perfected love there is made manifest perfect fidelity to his calling. It makes little difference whether we say of Jesus that he was wholly intent upon serving men in love with reference to their real weal, or whether we phrase his activity as that of one devoted with single eye to the calling which was his. For his calling was, as he indicated in speak-

ing to Peter, that of a fisher for men—he would win human souls and have them realize everlasting life. For this calling he renounced all—house and home, wife and marriage. The mysterious saying of Matt. xix. 12: "There are eunuchs which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake," that is, men who have made a renunciation for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, may have been a modest and reserved method of alluding to his own course of self-denial. Yet he made renunciation not for renunciation's sake; he did it in order that with all his power he might dedicate himself to his calling. And what this calling was is represented by the word "service": "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 23). Through him voluntary service was ennobled and received the stamp of the work which was most excellent and most worthy of men—and this definition of work is one the realization of which has yet to be learned by many peoples.

To this fidelity to calling belongs also a one-sided concentration upon just this vocation. It has already been remarked that Jesus

showed no activity which was directed toward the social, cultic, artistic, or scientific side of life; that of none of these things, so far as they were cultivated in the life of the Jewish people, he had an understanding, can, however, hardly be affirmed. One would rather be able to say the opposite, namely, that a man who in his parables manifested so many-sided a sense of the reality of all the relations of life, as we have learned was the case with Jesus, whose spiritual and mental life was so forceful and so broadly sympathetic, must have possessed both on his own account and in relation to his earthly task a deep knowledge of human life. In that case the concentration upon his earthly calling just noted is not the consequence of mental poverty or narrowness; it is, on the contrary, a voluntary limitation, an indication of the power which purposely circumscribed itself within the individual task before it, it is a sign of self-sacrificing fidelity to vocation.

## V

From this point of view of fidelity to calling there belongs, now finally, what is to be said concerning the death of Jesus. I am

aware that you are accustomed to regard the death of Jesus from another angle of vision, considering it as an evidence of love. In a certain sense that is quite true. But when we examine the matter closely, we see that this motive was only indirect, and we come nearer the whole truth when we regard the death of Jesus as a proof of his fidelity to calling. It has been a necessity heretofore to suppose that Jesus knew that his death was to come, knew it long before, and believed that this death was the one means available for the redemption of men, and that love to lost man demanded that he suffer that death. That was also the idea of primitive Christianity, and Paul impressed this interpretation strongly upon the dogmatic theory of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ whereby guilty man was saved from the curse of sin. This thought was so self-evident to early Christianity that it colored significantly the narrative of our evangelists, as that narrative dealt not only with the suffering, but even with the life of Christ. But we, or at least the majority of us, are in agreement that this method of construing the matter, by which the Jewish or heathen thought of sacrifice was attributed to Jesus,

is no longer possible for us because it sinks out of sight under the pure exaltation of faith in God as Jesus preached it. One may assert with great assurance that Jesus knew nothing of such theories. When in the parable of the prodigal son or of the roguish servant, he promised forgiveness in answer to the beseeching prayer, he certainly did not do so with the quiet reservation that this forgiveness would be made perfect only through the sacrifice on Golgotha. On the contrary, God is as royally merciful, as unreservedly free as the father or the master in the parables. If this be true, it follows that one may not assert that Jesus deliberately determined to die out of love for men and in order to their redemption. And the right view of the case is even yet quite significantly exhibited in the Gospels even under the later dogmatic cloaking of the facts.

Indeed, during the last days of his life Jesus was apprehensive of conflict and feared that in this conflict he would lose his life. But he was not willing to avoid this conflict, for by so doing he would have had to renounce his calling. He who preaches a religion which is thoroughly out of accord with the cultic or-

der already established, and is unlegalistic, must either overcome priests and scribes, who are the representatives of the established religion, or be overcome by them. That the latter was the more likely to be the issue of the unequal combat, Jesus doubtless, at the last, quite fully realized; but that he willed it cannot be thought. The entry into Jerusalem, the purification of the Temple, the contest with his opponents are but the last mighty efforts to gain the victory for his side. The prayer in Gethsemane: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me," loses its true and normal meaning, its affecting and thrilling significance, if Jesus had a definitely determined theory in fidelity to which he both must die and determined to die. It must be denied that he willed his death as a necessary part of his labors. He hoped and believed that his death would in some way work out for good to his own; and at the last supper, when he took leave of his disciples, by a symbolical treatment he gave expression to this belief. But it was by way of faith, that is, sheer confidence in Almighty God, whose wonder-working ways he did not fully comprehend but foreboded.

It has been a cause of much wonder, indeed some have taken offence at the fact, that in Gethsemane Jesus trembled and shrank from his fate, that he three times prayed for the passing of the cup from his lips. And the offence has to these same people seemed the greater when they compared his course with that of martyrs of the Church, many of whom, according to unimpeachable tradition, went to their death with joyous enthusiasm. Were not here the disciples greater than the master? Not at all. They had what he had not, what indeed he first won and acquired for them—the confirmed assurance that through the cross the crown is gained. They traveled a known road, he had first broken the way; he was the Winkelried* who broke the path for his people.

Let us now state the case as it was: Jesus had come with the commission to preach the kingdom of heaven which, so to speak, stood

* Translator's Note. Arnold Winkelried was the traditional Swiss hero of the battle of Sempach, July 9, 1386, between the Austrians and the Swiss. He led the Swiss phalanx, gathered in his own breast the lances of a group of opposing foemen, and thus made an opening for his compatriots, who split the Austrian ranks and gained a complete victory. Consult A. Schweitzer, *Eine Studie zur Schlacht bei Sempach* (Zurich, 1902).

before the door and was intended for his people. The longer he worked the greater were his hopes, not only to proclaim this kingdom, but to see its realization and to become its king. But what became of these hopes [toward the last]? The political and religious leaders of the people persecuted him with deadly hate. The attitude of the populace was throughout fickle; and his disciples—to be sure they loved him devotedly, but how little they understood him and how small was their power! They lay overcome with sleep while he was battling for his soul; for his soul, not for his physical life, for faith in himself and his work, for his moral existence for which there was pledged not the smallest forfeit and which depended wholly on faith and hazard. Moreover the figure of Jesus does not shrink if we abandon the old theory of his sacrificial death; contrariwise, it then seems to present itself in wholly heroic size. Now the act of Jesus becomes a deed of faith without a parallel, the deed of a faith shown by an individual most unique; it hoped when apparently there was nothing for which to hope, it dared where there was no pledge as reward for daring, but only the voice of

God within his own breast, to which obedience was to be given. This act raised faith as a standard for a new humanity, and thus Jesus became the beginner and the fulfiller of faith. This victory of faith ever remains an object of wonder; it would be simply inconceivable could we not grasp it as the summit of a life devoted to constant obedience grounded in faith.

May we dare to say yet a word regarding the faith of Jesus—that is, not on his doctrine but on his personal religion? Shall we succeed in hitting upon the right thing, in saying that which shall reach the measure of the greatness of the fact? First of all let it be remarked that the whole genius of Jesus, so far as we have hitherto portrayed it in its energy, saneness, truth, inner freedom, love and fidelity, is not intelligible apart from the root and source of its being, the life and being of God. Jesus can be no more fundamentally misrepresented them by regarding him as an enlightener and preacher of morality while at the same time overlooking his faith in God. And this faith in God became so active in his entire being and life from the one fact that he was so single-eyed. The truism is once more met

that the greatest thing is ever the purely plain and simple. "Above all things to fear God, to love him, and to trust him"—this classical definition from Luther's catechism sums up the case. The religion of Jesus rests upon the sure foundation of fear of God, veneration of the Almighty Judge before whom we must give account for every idle word, who knows every thought of our heart. Every breath of his being he drew with constant reverential thought of this Judge, and this fact accounts for the purity and fearlessness of his being. "Be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" [Matt. x. 28]. But this almighty Judge is at the same time a merciful and gracious Father, full of illimitable love for all his creatures. For this reason it is that we may love and trust him. And so, why care for body and life? He clothes the lilies of the field, feeds the birds of the heaven, he knows the number of the hairs on our heads; hence there is due him a boundless confidence, and to love him with the whole heart, mind, and strength. Yet in this love of Jesus for God there is nothing that offends feeling

or sentiment, it is ever sound, vital, creative. He has bound fast together love of God and love of man; he knows no love of God that is not confirmed in love of man. Most surely Jesus enjoyed the love of God with a feeling of assurance, joyousness, and peace such as no man had before him. But his religion, his piety, did not proceed from this enjoyment as did that of the mystics. He enjoyed love to the accompaniment which was soundest and most true, that of unremitting toil for God's cause: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work" [John iv. 34].

The power for this unwearying activity he received in prayer. Most frequently the Evangelists report that Jesus prayed. That this was a purely human prayer, a reaching out of the weak hand which required help toward the strong and supporting father-arm of God, is shown with striking significance by the struggle in Gethsemane. But his whole life was carried along on the wings of prayer. How characteristic is the incident reported by Mark in his first chapter! Jesus had worked the entire day in Capernaum under great stress, healing and preaching. The

next morning he arose before sunrise, went to a solitary place, and prayed. When his disciples found him, he took them with him to new activity with the words: "Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth." Prayer was not with him, as with the mystics, a matter of gratification; it was a catching of the breath, a re-creation of strength, in order to new activity, to new work in the service of God, for God's work.

God's work, not Jesus'. In spite of the strong self-consciousness of Jesus, which comes out in his messianic faith, the fundamental sentiment in the mind of Jesus was that of religion, of reverence before Almighty and Eternal God, which was so strong that he spoke of himself as connected with man and not with God. The Evangelist John has well characterized the result of the work of Jesus in the beautiful saying: "I am the way, the truth, and the life"; but Jesus would not himself have employed such an expression. It is not forgotten that he unconditionally required that they who were his disciples should confess him: "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father

which is in heaven" [Matt. x. 33]. But he had no theory which required that men confess him as a means of coming to God. On the other hand, he bound men to do the will of God alone. He expected men not to say "Lord, Lord!" but "to do the will of the heavenly Father," and they who fulfilled God's will were to him as mother and brother and sister. So to that woman who, in an outbreak of the feelings of a mother, felicitated the womb that bare him and the breast which gave him nourishment he returned the answer: "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." Possibly this is the greatest thing that can be said of the religion of Jesus, that with unconditioned reverence he ever placed God before himself—God, to whom he belonged body and soul.

* * *

You heard in the first lecture that it has once more become the fashion to question the historical existence of Jesus, and to regard the Gospels as the retort into which went the social and religious streams of thought and impulses of the civilizations which existed in the Mediterranean basin. Can you believe

that a picture such as we have concerned ourselves at this session to trace out could have been fabricated from such indefinite and unpersonal streams of thought? Could anything whatever be so fabricated and invented? There remain yet many intelligent men and women who openly confess that they are not able to avow faith in such a miracle of chance. Their open confession is: We prefer to remain old-fashioned people, in all humility and confidence believing in the personal Almighty God and in the man Jesus Christ, the highest earthly revelation of the Eternal God and the captain of our faith.

# Jesus As Force

BY

PASTOR E. FOERSTER, TH. D.

## IV

## JESUS AS FORCE

The two lectures to which you have listened immediately preceding the present one, aimed to give an answer to the question: Who was Jesus? It is the firm conviction of my friends, and also my own, that it is possible to apprehend the original nature of this wonderful man; and the freer from prejudice and from attachment to theories a man is when he comes to the tradition, the better. Deficient and incomplete though the sources are which contain the reports, shot through with legendary elements and interwoven with fabulous details as they are, it yet is possible to answer the one question to which everything really comes—what did Jesus really will, and what was his character? We are not to be misled because in a search of this sort the dilettanti bestir themselves and apply to the search their uncritically furnished inventive faculty or because they succeed only in confusing the

problem, or in hewing through it with hastily prepared *tours de la parole* because they have not patience and self-denial to bring to the solution (qualities without which it is not possible to discover truth). We are happy and proud to be able to say that, thanks to earnest and rigorous labors which have been going on for more than a century, since the days of Lessing—and this principally on German soil —we of to-day know Jesus better and understand more completely the original meaning of his sayings than has been at any time the case since the second century. The joy we feel in this eminence of German theology we expect to bring into emphatic expression. And we commiserate the people who feel no gladness arising from this great accomplishment of science, whether because the result does not agree with their own prejudices and wishes, or because they value only such results of scientific inquiry as permit of transmutation into terms of technical advance, esthetic pleasure, or political power.

But, is perchance this scientific gain a damage to personal force of life? What science has presented to us is and remains a greatness that belongs to the past. Yes, it is just this

which, in the course of our labors, Jesus has rightly become. The deeper we delve the more we must perceive that exactly this great form is indissolubly bound up with a distant past and a region very remote. There can be no other result. If we treat earnestly the thought that Jesus is a historical person, it goes without further remark that he belonged in the train of the general development of civilization, that from its impulses and limitations he drew the material of his thoughts and that which went to form his character, that thence came the questions which were his to answer, the horizon which circumscribed his mental picture of the world, and innumerable other things which conditioned his being. No man is original in the sense that he is independent of the heritage of the past. The content of an individuality is ever already prepared before the personality itself becomes manifest. Only of Almighty God may pious faith dare to think and to perceive that he created the world out of nothing—of him and of no one else. But of Jesus Paul penned the profound saying that he was sent "in the fullness of time." From that of which the time was full did Jesus create his inner life.

The way in which he rejected some part of this ready material, took another part, put it together and developed it—that was his own, it was He.

It was especially the second lecture in this course which put prominently forward the connectedness of the thought-world of Jesus with the views and interpretation of things in his time. You will permit me just as strongly to emphasize the other side of the case, namely, that Jesus was a historical personality. Included in this thought is not merely that he was a debtor to the time that had passed before he was born, but also that he had no part in the time that has gone by since his appearance. A historic personality remains fixed in its place, but the stream of events flows uninterruptedly forward and carries with itself the sons of men. They cannot remain fixed with any personality, wish it though they may. New knowledge, new tasks, new experience are ever eventuating, of which the man of the past knows nothing. And what a welling fullness of new life has been presented to humanity in the last centuries of its development! How the world and time have extended into immeasurability! This enlarge-

ment and enrichment have gripped upon our personal life in its depth, have transformed it, have made questions to obtrude, have produced tensions, in all of which our closest interests have become involved. We have come to see the world as an unending existence which we comprehend as a continuity under the reign of law. Consequently, the question arises to torment us, how it is that within this immeasurable, perhaps purely mechanical collection of causes and activities the personal life, the individual will, and the eternal purposes permit of maintenance. We live in a time of unlimited "becoming," we have an outlook into abysses of time behind and before; we are able to regard man and humanity as nothing else than a passage way and a bridge to unknown possibilities. The obligation to coming generations, to all that is yet to become, is the potency which defines our thought and action. Moreover, the most significant thing of all is that we have ourselves become a problem to solve. We perceive in the life of the human soul an inextricable interwoven fabric, its outlook and its exposition are the most seductive object of the art of poet and painter, its study is the most sub-

lime task of science, treatment of it is the most difficult art of the teacher. A new world of thought and impulses is in process of becoming, in comparison with which the world in which the men of antiquity moved seems like a little deserted village.

And in all this Jesus has no part. He stands on the other side of Copernicus and Columbus, Kant and Darwin, Rembrandt and Goethe. When we present this fact to our consciousness, is it not as though a wall rears itself before our gaze and interposes between him and ourselves? A thinker of our day, who has made careful investigation of the essence and worth of historical personality, has called particular attention to the fact that we use the word historical in a threefold sense.* We may say that Luther's expression: "Here I stand, I can no other," or Tell's when bound to the plateau at Vierwaldstättersee, or the victory at Königgrätz are historical or not historical. By this is meant that the events related did or did not occur.

* Heinrich Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung,* pp. 369-370, Tübingen, 1902. This is one of the most ponderous, though rich and profound, works of the newer philosophy.

That Jesus is for us in this sense a historical personality has been explicitly shown in the first lecture of this series. The attempt to combat this we can but regard as purposed flights outside the realm of reality. We may also assert that this or that was a historic moment, as when Henry IV. went to Canossa, or when Luther nailed his theses to the church door October 31, 1517, or when Zeppelin made his flight August 4, 1908. By this we intend to say that the event was important and significant, that it lifts itself above the ordinary, and merits retention in the memory. For not everything that happens anywhere is an object of historical tradition, only that which has important consequences and awakens interest. I trust that the second and third lectures have shown us anew that in this sense also Jesus is historical, an appearance of supreme greatness among men. We use the word "historical" also in a third sense. We may say that this or that has become historical, that it belongs only to history; things of this sort are the flint and steel, the post coach, Klopstock's *Messias,* and the pope's interdict. In using the term with reference to certain events or persons we put them alongside of the dead—

they may have had value and importance for earlier steps in civilization, but for us and the present they have no such worth; we are, therefore, not accustomed to stir up such subjects and to dispute concerning them, we refer them to antiquarians. Is Jesus in this sense also "historic"? The worth of Jesus for the present—that is the problem into which every consideration of his person finally issues.

I think you all perceive, as my friends certainly hold, that this is a prior and decisive question. For to say that the Christian religion is true, is not the same as saying that once there lived a man Jesus, who gave the impulse from which originated the New Testament literature and the construction of really notable propositions concerning God and the world. What such a statement means is that with him there entered into the course of history something that was enduring—as we men use the word—an eternal good. It is then sure that the questions, what Jesus was and what he willed, are only preliminary and subsidiary questions; they may not be raised at all, and if raised, not a great deal of ardor and diligence will be expended upon

the answer to them, unless there intervenes that mysterious feeling that this Jesus is a matter of concern to us to-day and has much to say to us. And so burning a question is this now that I can easily understand how it is that many would be willing to attempt to leap over or pass by the question who Jesus was, especially if the historical investigation concerning him appeared idle and unfruitful in comparison with their little toil, with the results of their producing, which are ever only conditionally valuable. But we must take the firm stand that we may not deprive ourselves of the help and control afforded by science in deciding what value Jesus has for us; for without this we run the risk of receiving a Christ that has been invented and dreamed, one that has been fabricated to meet the needs of an individual or a community. Yet as a matter of fact, no investigation can of itself ever present or deprive us of the decision; we must ourselves pronounce it upon the basis of experience and the demands of our own souls.

## II

So long as there is a Christianity, so long as there are men and women who confess

themselves followers of Jesus, so long is there the firm conviction that Jesus is not a magnitude that is of the past, but that he is of the present. Never was this faith held with greater assurance and a higher inspiration than where it was least to be expected, namely, in the generation which had itself experienced the sorrow of the death of Jesus. This faith expressed itself in the conviction (1) that Jesus as the exalted Lord, though invisible, was yet active and near his own, and (2) that his Spirit continued to live in the circle of his disciples. In order to understand these representations it is necessary to note that religious faith can express itself only in imaginative language, its normal mode of speech is the "myth." This "myth" of the Christ who had been taken away from earth, had gone to another place, and had ascended to the throne of God, whence he was again to descend in order to complete the interrupted work of establishing the government of God, is, as every one sees, inseparably connected with the three-storied universe of antiquity. Where this conception of the universe no longer has force—and it does not obtain among us—the "myth" referred to can no

longer govern thought, its re-presentative capability is gone. We lack the qualifications for the reception of this faith in the form in which it was held by the people of that time; the general framework is gone into which the picture of the Exalted One naturally fitted. The second conception named above (that of the continuance of the Spirit with the disciples) better fits in with our mode of thinking. Yet even here it is necessary to note that primitive Christianity understood by "the Spirit" which was poured out upon the hearts of the faithful something much more gross than that which we mean when we employ the word "Spirit."

But we cannot stop to discuss whether it is feasible to maintain these conceptions; the question rather takes the form: What experiences of the soul built them up? What needs of the soul evoked such a picture? How did primitive Christianity have communion with him who had died on the cross, who no longer dwelt with them in bodily form? In what characteristic marks did it find his nearness, his presence? There were in those ancient times men who were stimulated by the world which was about them to the reception of vis-

ions, hallucinations, hearing of voices from heaven, the noting of oracles and signs, to whom it was self-evidently a commonplace to perceive deity in physical or soul-life. Was it by these means that primitive Christians assured themselves of the presence also of the deceased Jesus? Is the origin of faith in the Lord as continuing to live to be placed in experiences which, from our standpoint, are regarded as in part naively childish, in part pathological?

But danger menaces this path, though its seductions entice again and again. Even Paul reports such immediate intercourse with the Christ who had been translated to heaven, and tells of meeting him and having speech with him. And still more than he, the lesser lights of his generation luxuriated in ecstatic visions, glossolalia, prophesying, in stories of healing of the sick, wonderful answers to prayer, and interventions [from above], and thereby nourished faith in the presence of Jesus.

But wonderful to relate! This very generation, whose attention thus aroused was directed to heaven, is the creatrix of our Gospel literature; it collected with the care of a

thrifty householder every little circumstance in the life of Jesus, every saying and proverb that fell from his lips, in the endeavor that nothing be lost, intermingling meanwhile many an ungenuine thing; it fixed all this in writing, made translations of it, and began to read the Scriptures, thus originated, in its assemblies. "I know of no fact that is much more astounding than this" is the remark of S. Eck (in *Hefte zur christlichen Welt,* 1898, no. 32, p. 21). But equally astounding is another fact, that all search and grasping after wonder-working activities of the Spirit cannot obscure the conviction that the most precious of all God's gifts is love, the power to lead a life of purity and goodness; that this is more worthful than the speaking with tongues and the sight of things that may not be told, than retirement from the world and resignation of it (I Cor. xiii.).

There can be no doubt as to the way in which to interpret these facts. The experience of the presence of Jesus did not rest on those unsound and mysterious experiences, but rather on his manifest words and the idea of his earthly existence; and the absorbing token of the abiding association with him was

that love which showed the spirit of ministering affection, which the historical Jesus had fulfilled. Out of contact with the spiritual content which was concealed in the vessel of this historical appearance grew the faith in the living Lord.

Here is an important guidepost, which yet has often enough remained unobserved in Christianity. Ever again and again has the longing of the pious stormed against the walls which separate from our world that world in which the dead live; and fancy has brought help to this eager longing and mirrored forth the fulfilment of its wish. On the other hand it has constantly been shown that this is no road to a firm conviction that can support one in the storm and stress of doubt, and that the revelations which men claimed to receive were only too often nothing but the results of their own vanity, thirst for power, and sensuousness. Luther denied the right of existence in the Evangelical church to manifestations of this sort of piety, when he fought against the fanatics and Anabaptists. The presence of Jesus as a continually operating force can, for us, have no other significance than the presence of the historical fact that,

nineteen hundred years ago in a corner of the Roman world, Jesus taught, healed, fought, and suffered, and, perhaps after only a year of this activity, died.

## III

In what ways do facts that belong to the past continue to operate? In just two ways and no more: through things or through persons, by works or by recollection.* The first method may be illustrated from the field of technical invention. There can be no doubt that the life of man is fundamentally changed because of the invention of the steam engine and the railroad; how great a change these have produced may be learned from any exposition of the development of commercial life during the nineteenth century. These works continue to exist and to operate altogether independently of their originators. Thousands travel on the railroads who know nothing whatever of George Stephenson, millions have to do with machines without the slightest thought of James Watt. Moreover, the man who first hollowed a tree and made

* This useful distinction I borrow from an unpublished lecture by Professor Samuel Eck, of Giessen.

the attempt to journey over water, he who first tempered iron in fire, he who first smoothed stone and built a house with it—who and what kind of men were these? Of them we have no knowledge. They live solely through their works; we reason to their existence from the law that each thing must have its cause, but no personal recollection of them remains. The second method is that which occurs when there comes before the mind's eye the image of a dear one—a father, perhaps, or a friend—who is separated from us. Here, too, there may be the auxiliary working of some thing or event—a letter which the departed had written, a song which he used to sing, a withered bouquet, a place which we had visited together. But evidently our relation to these things is entirely different from our relation to the works of industry and the like already referred to. These things of which we now speak may have no intrinsic value, either that of money or for purposes of utility or as works of art; they may conceivably be not even the products of him whom they recall to memory; they may be simply the means by which a certain mental individuality lives again in us, or they may

be a trait of this person—his love, or earnestness, or diligence, or cheerfulness, it may be his grief or rivalry. They have value to us as memorials of a personal life. They work their effects upon us, make us sad or glad, render us elated or ashamed, stimulate us to tears or make our hearts beat faster with joy. Apart from the individual with whom they by chance came into connection, they are as nothing; but through this connection they receive their entire significance as vessels and vestments of a soul which still speaks to us. The worth of these things passes over into personal value. Indeed such externals are not necessary as stimuli, for within us, unevoked by such things, may rise the figure of some long past fact. This abiding presence of the past in us we call memory.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, allow me to add the following. In the distinction between the continued operation of the impersonal and the personal I have referred to what was merely and purely external, within which history ran its course. But men do not as a matter of fact dissect the past into things which operate materially and those which operate personally. There could hardly exist a

man who would come into consideration purely and solely as the originator of some industrial product. Even though for those who had no intimacy with him he had significance only through this product, in the hearts of widow and children he would continue to live as a personality. And it is to be noted with equal emphasis that the circle in which this operation through works is active is usually incomparably larger than that in which interest concerns what the man really was. Still more important is the observation that distinction cannot always be made between this continued operation by means of the material and that by means of personality. We recognize this at once when we take into account the heritage left by an artist or a thinker. To be sure, the dramas of Sophocles carry with them their own life, and it is hardly likely that anyone under their influence would be led by them to call up for himself the figure of the poet. Grünewald's Isenheimer altar speaks immediately to the spectator, even though the person of the painter remains wholly in obscurity.* Spinoza's

* Translator's Note. Matthias Grünewald was a German painter of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth

*Ethica* will be the object of abiding esteem for its contents and the conclusiveness of its reasoning alone. And yet you all feel that the work of the artist and the scientist do not so permit of disconnection from their creators as does, for instance, the plate from which food is taken from the potter who turned it. The work of artist or thinker continues to live not independent of its creator, in its form it bears along with it into the future something of the soul of him who created it. Edison invented the telephone and Schiller wrote *Die Räuber;* but when we see *Die Räuber* represented, our relation to the personality of Schiller is altogether different from our relation to the personality of Edison as we use the telephone.

## IV

From these general considerations we now return to Jesus. In what way do we of to-day,

centuries, of whose life it is known only that he was born in Aschaffenburg and lived most of his life in Mainz. His masterpiece, created between 1493 and 1516, was the high altar at Isenheim in Upper Alsace, on which were the figures of St. Sebastian, St. Anthony, St. Paul, and the Madonna. The work is now in the museum at Colmar.

we who are here gathered in this hall, experience an influence from the historical fact—Jesus?

It is at first glance significant that we have to thank him for no one of the material possessions which we use and find profitable. I may call to your recollection the observation of Naumann, to which attention was directed in a former lecture (ante, pp. 85-86). Through Jesus [directly] no country road was improved, no smallest corner of nature was subjected to the dominance of the human spirit, no state boundaries were changed on the earth's surface, no social or ecclesiastical institutions were created. What is called "culture" in the narrower sense received neither impulse nor opposition from him. Of course, it is possible that those who did act upon it were under the influence of Jesus, that from him they received their courage and hope, their steadfastness and fidelity; but the stimulus to apply their creative zeal and their force to these things—to scientific problems, to advance in mechanics, to national, social, or economic gain, to interest in nature and to the impetus to overcome it—did not originate from Jesus. So the fact lies open to the eye

that for a fullness of the gains of culture and of political and social rights, which, indeed, we would not be without, we are under obligations to men who had no relationship to Jesus, as also for forces and motives which had their birthplace elsewhere than in the thought-world of Jesus. He who is not sightless will not deny that the most significant, if not the only leverage to this progress has been the impulse to self-preservation. It engineers invention and discovery, conquers wastes and moors and subdues them to the purposes of human habitation, it inflames to war and wins political rights and economic success and social recognition. Of course, this impulse is a gift of God, and the pious are ever under the influence of wonder at the way in which the Eternal leads mankind by means of profit and loss from obscurity into light; but every attempt to make Jesus the originator of this impulse (such as that which Rousseau made) is an injustice to Jesus and is shattered unfailingly upon the rock of his sayings and his cross.

And yet, one may speak of a continuance of operation through material things that is traceable to Jesus. As a fact we are girded

about with activities that hark back to his historical appearance, that have, so to speak, emanated from his person and pass on among us, from hand to hand, without awakening the realization in us that they are coins of Jesus' mintage. And this truth is not limited to things, but applies to the thoughts and dispositions, convictions and norms, which are the possession of the men of to-day, particularly in the Protestant world, though they may in various ways have become attenuated, enfeebled, and united with foreign material; they have become incarnated, so to speak, in flesh and blood, are ever the immediate foundation of mental life. We cannot sever this element of our thinking and experience from our life without cutting ourselves off essentially from the culture of mankind and breaking with it entirely (as indeed Schopenhauer and Nietzsche did). Whoever will not do this lives in possession of these things, even though he care not at all about the person of Jesus.

A first impression of such a deposit of Christian thoughts, dispositions, norms, and ideals may be gained in the following manner. We may take under consideration three

men, Albrecht Dürer, Goethe, and Bismarck, who possessed natures of the utmost dissimilarity. That in spite of this dissimilarity there was a community of relationship among them will become at once evident to you when I put the question whether it is at all conceivable that men of those types could have developed in a world that was controlled by Buddhistic teaching. The answer cannot be in doubt. So characteristic a genius as breathes in the creations of Dürer, so delightful an appreciation of the individual as is evident in the productions of Goethe, the artist in life, and so titanic a series of achievements as that of Bismarck's could not take form in the heavy air of the Indian religion—a faith that would obliterate personality, that regards individuality as a burden, and would let activity lapse in sleep.

Is it possible in some measure to comprehend and to define according to its contents this stock of modern humanity, which is a common possession yet takes many forms and is the resort of all? The attempt is often enough made; indeed the lure is so attractive that the best powers ever set themselves the task. I offer here the exposition of an ob-

server of modern life, a man only recently deceased, who was possessed of a fine delicacy of perception and thought—the Berlin philosopher, Friedrich Paulsen. He pictured in the following fashion the Christian undercurrent in the modern view of the world and life, the penetrating operation of Jesus in our thinking and feeling (*System der Ethik,* i. 141-148, Berlin, 1896): Christianity has engraved three great verities in the mental life of man. First, Christianity has revealed an appreciation of suffering as an essential in the life of man to which the Greek world never attained. Suffering is no more a brutal fact, it is the way to inner peace, a condition which is necessary for the complete development of mankind. We men of the present know nothing more penetrating or greater than this to say of suffering, from which no life is free. We either understand it and so bear it, or we understand it not at all. Second, as with suffering, so sin and guilt are essential sides of the life of man. This verity was either seen not at all by the man of ancient times, or not discerned in its full measure. Christianity sees as a most serious and fearful fact that in the very being of the natural man

deeply rooted is a tendency to evil. This perception takes its rise from the ineradicable impression of the righteousness and holiness which took form in Jesus. By this is afforded a simply crushing norm. Paulsen continues as follows: "This method of seeing the fact is inextricably interwoven in the fabric of our being. To accept evil so unconcernedly as did the Greeks, to regard one's own life with so naive self-satisfaction as was possible to Greeks and Romans—these are no longer possible for us. At a modern funeral are occasionally sung those lines of Horace beginning, *Integer vitae scelerisque purus;* I am not sure but that for the dead, if he can hear it, this song has something embarrassing. It may call up the recollection of the beginning of that prayer of the Pharisee: 'God, I thank thee that I am not as other men.' And I question whether at that moment the close of the song with its sweetly smiling refrain contains aught that is edifying for him. Better at the end is the old refrain sung on Good Friday: 'Christ, thou lamb of God, who takest away the sin of the world, have mercy upon us.' The proud saying of the dying Julian: 'I die without repentance, for I have lived without

guilt,' may perchance be possible for us as we stand before the judgment seat of man; but how is it when we are before the judgment seat of our own conscience or before the bar of God?"

The third great verity which Christianity has impressed in us is that the world lives through the voluntary martyr death of the innocent and righteous. From a historical and philosophical standpoint it is the most profound truth that the secret of peoples' life lies in the fact that the best and most unselfish, the strongest and purest, offer themselves as sacrifices. The best that man possesses has been obtained in this way, and the reward for the service was misjudgment, neglect, expulsion, death. Jesus opened the eyes of men that they might see this and by it aroused in individual cases ever anew the desire for sacrifice, and in many established a disposition of gratitude for life as a heritage from the saints. To these three verities Paulsen adds a fourth, namely, the desire for the supramundane. Antiquity was satisfied with the earth; the modern world finds in a sensation of dissatisfaction with the existent realities something continually recurrent. Echoes

of the declaration which Christianity made to the East, that the true home of the soul is not this earth, that the present life is a pilgrimage in a foreign land, are heard in poetry and time the step of modern life even among children of the world. The necessity of raising oneself above the present world in prescient sighing for reality of a higher order is so ingrained in modern humanity that to eradicate it would require an entire reconstitution of man.

These subtle and profound remarks by Paulsen can certainly not meet your ear and attention without awakening you to the realization that they vibrate in harmony with chords which belong to your inner life. Who can follow out a train of thought like this and not be convinced how profoundly and closely we have grown up in touch with Christianity, how the spiritual substance of the preacher of the Sermon on the Mount and of him who died on the cross has become a part of our own inner life? But you will have noticed that the connection between individual realizations of this sort has not been brought to expression, and above all their immediate derivation from the person of Jesus. It seems

to me that there is a still simpler and more unified method of showing how among us the continual force of Jesus' life is operative. In one of our lectures last year there was made the statement that, "Christianity stands or falls with the dictum: 'What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' " [Matt. xvi. 26]. In repeating this, we express the very core of the Gospel, and perception of it does not require philosophic training or stress of thought; on the contrary, everyone who has eyes to see will perceive it, and just as it always has been perceived. The very center of the mission and the personality of Jesus is a rock-firm and effectually assured belief in the eternal worth of the human soul. This worth Jesus recognized and loved in every man, even in the lowest and the polluted, where national perversity and social prejudice made its discovery impossible—in the Samaritan and the heathen woman, in publicans and sinners, in children and women. This worth he fostered with gentle hand and in behalf of it battled with passionate indignation. His whole ethics may be summed up in a passion for sincerity and fidelity to one's own personality

and for love to everything that bore the stamp of humanity and bore in its breast the germ of personal life. His path of suffering enfleshed obedience to personality, which he might not put to shame by compromise and dissembling and would not sacrifice by silence or denial. His faith in God evinced his understanding of the power over all things which sprang from this confidence (in personality) : and he knew nothing more exalted to say of it than that it is full of soul, merciful and protective, abounding in sympathy and joy in human life.

This faith in the eternal worth of human personality is the productive soil from which sprang the entire round of Jesus' thought; it affords the key to the understanding of suffering, guilt, sacrifice, and the unconditioned assurance of another life. Jesus' teaching and person are but the incarnation and application of this faith; hence it may be asserted that only from this premise can one attain to acquiescence in his thoughts and disposition. In saying this I do not overlook the fact that other leaders of mankind, before Jesus and independent of him, have reached and felt the truth of this conclusion. Indeed in germ

and obscurely, this truth lives in every man, and it is truth only because every man is constituted in it. But Jesus expressed this truth so that children may understand it, and he brought to experience both the directive keenness and the blessed delight that are inherent in it so that neither causes slights to the other. Above all important is the serious earnestness with which he treated it. To be sure, he did not prove it; but it is not a thing that is susceptible of proof. The one proof is that if we disown it or let go of it, we find ourselves in a condition of dire unhappiness.

And now I maintain that this belief in personality is the force in human history which impels to progress, and that it is more clearly and profoundly comprehended by the men of to-day than ever before. It rages and storms in all earnest and trying contests, and that not as a secondary concomitant phenomenon, but down in the very fundamentals, where the springs well up and the ore is found. What else was it that inspired the soul of Roger Williams, the father of modern democracy, and what else came to expression in the exposition of the rights of man, than this faith? It gives to modern movements among

workers their momentum and passion; it is at the basis of the campaign of the modern woman for social-legal standing and completer opportunities in life. It compels us ever anew to think through the problem of the instruction of our sons and daughters, and to stand in awe before the mystery of the soul of a child. What does freedom of science mean if not reverence in the presence of personal conviction? What is sincerity in art but the striving for a pure expression of personal life? Yet we are not to regard this belief as though it were a gentle balsam or a refreshing draught. It ought rather to be compared with hot iron. Where business or political interests would absorb control, where a masterly folk would despoil a minority of tradition or mother speech,* where a ruling class would hinder their dependents from manifesting their opinions, there this belief stalks forth with threatening mien. Firmly and relentlessly it haled before its tribunal Church and school in order to inquire whether their ordinances and the direction of their ac-

* Translator's Note. Possibly a reference to the rigorous attempts of the imperial government of Germany to Teutonize Prussian Poland.

tivities accorded with freedom of conscience; it rose in rage where merely the faintest sign appeared of persecution of thought and opinion. It fought and endured and bled; it was like a pillar of fire that directed man on his way to unknown blessed remotenesses. And this fire was kindled by Jesus. In this faith we are related to him, we all stand within the sphere of operation of his appearance, we experience the transformation of our lives through him. So long as this faith affects us, fights in us, consoles us, quells us, Jesus has not yet become historic. But when it shall once for all have gained complete victory, the kingdom of God will be present.

## V

There are no doubt many among you who regard our theme as exhausted. I believe that the continuing effects of the life of Jesus among a large, a very large, majority of the men of to-day are confined to this permeation of the idea of personality and to its participation in the deposit of thoughts and motives—a permeation which disengages itself in every one, but in very varying degrees of

strength and fullness. And it does not seem to me a false statement that the belief in the indelible nobility of personality is the religion of modern man, so far as he is capable of religion, that is, of devotion and reverence. Naturally I leave out of the question the great multitude of those who are sunk in materialism, whether of a coarse or a more refined quality, for the presence of such men is no peculiar possession of our day—they have existed in all time. But within the circle of present day manhood there is a smaller circle of those who do not believe that in what has been said the theme of the continuous operation flowing from the person of Jesus has been exhausted. With them there goes through life the memory of Jesus, like that of a brother or a friend, the memory of his words, the recollection of the characteristic stories of his intercourse with men and of his brave deeds. They realize the necessity of drinking deep and true at the fountain of tradition concerning him and of finding therein sources for the renewing of secret individual life. It is their heart's wish that this heritage be not lost, that its use may become wider and its presence more fully known. Such men value

above all things spiritual converse with the person of Jesus. We would like to know that our lectures are understood as voices from this circle. It is out of this exactly that there grows the further task in the process of taking stock of asking what value there is in this memory of Jesus. Does it possess value and produce fruit? Or is this recollection mere pleasurable occupation or the consequence of a senseless habit?

Let us think through the following train of thought before answering. Spiritual communion with the Jesus of the New Testament might have been for a more primitive mankind worthful, even necessary. Contemplation of his form and the preaching of the apostles and of the Church may have been helpful in awakening and strengthening faith in his personality. But in our times this belief no longer requires such insufficient investiture and repeated inculcation. It has cast away the form which had become too restricted and continues to live free and independent, meanwhile ever creating for itself new and greater incarnations. It has absorbed within itself that earlier faith which hung upon and clung to the person of Jesus, and its

present declaration is: Though the shell is utterly demolished, the noble contents continues to exist. Does it retain the purpose of going back to its historical origin, and is not that merely a scientific interest in antiquarian research? Physicists have taught us to recognize as the law in the world of nature that one force converts itself into another and is lost in that other; heat is converted into motion and motion into light. Who thanks the burned coals that set the wheels in motion when, having arrived at his goal, he leaves the express? Or who, sitting under the friendly light of the electric lamp, thinks of the whir of the machinery, without which he would sit in darkness? And why should we not with joy and inspiration allow ourselves to be led along by the idea of personality without joining in a cult followed by our ancestors in company with its renowned celebrants?

But to this course of thought, enticing though it sounds, I and my friends reply with an unconditional and well-considered negative. We decline to be seduced into giving up veneration before the person of Jesus of Nazareth in behalf of a cultus of the idea of personality, for we fear that with the one we

should lose also the other. We consider that it is not merely a case of scientific exactness or the claim that we should be faithful to history that requires us to keep in mind this connection. Rather the interests of faith in personality itself insist upon all this.

There is a wide difference between spiritual forces and physical forces. The latter, even if we cannot create them, we can evoke, subdue, and master. But spiritual forces emanate from mysterious depths over which we exercise no mastery, and they are embedded in man. Only and simply our intercourse with man tells us what is meant by love and hate, good and bad, truth and lie; or rather, we become sensible of them in man. From the aspects presented by human individuals, from contact of our own souls with those of others, these conceptions receive their inexhaustibly rich content, which defies description. If it were conceivable to isolate a man completely and finally, all these great things would lose for him their content and their significance; he would then be under the influence of the forces of nature, but no longer under those of the soul, and would himself become a mere being of nature. So it

is with faith in personality. It lives in the breast because of the influence which good and great men exercise over us, and it lives upon this influence. It is not a verity that is inborn in us, nor can it be reached through the processes of logical thinking; it is inseparably connected with the recollection of concrete individualities, before which doubt concerning the nobility of the human soul seems a wretched and poor thing; so we win the courage and the joy, we even regard it an ethical duty, to exempt the soul from the general law of extinction.

There is a fable which tells of the giant Antaeus, who could not be overcome by his foes because by contact with his mother Earth he ever obtained new and mightier power. Similarly faith creates and absorbs its vital force through uninterrupted connection with the concrete reality of heroes and saints. So far as these actually linger among us—and every way of life is traversed by such saints, though their names are often humble and they appear in lowly guise—this intercourse completes itself by unenvious and delicately responsive reception of their being into our own, and so far as they belong to the

past, this comes about by the process of fostering their memory.

One who agrees with this would be terrified at the thought that at any time remembrance of the person of Jesus and regard for his individuality should be lost. It would be a depredation of manhood itself, taking away that which is most fundamental in its constitution. To be sure, belief in personality would not equally be lost, for God has called up many witnesses to this, and in manifold embodiments it is to be found in the world. And we rejoice because of this fact, and listen with grateful affection wherever the note of devoted and genuine life makes itself heard. But we do this great fact no wrong when we look beyond the great cloud of witnesses to Jesus, the author and finisher of faith. For no remembrance can equal the remembrance of Jesus in presenting an invincible resistance to the timid doubts which at times assail us and the piercing anxiety which seeks out even in the greatest the traces of littleness and weakness. Without it, the idea of the true worthfulness of man fades like a figure in the fog, and there comes a tottering of the understanding of the world and of life which is

built upon this firm foundation. Into every life come critical hours of discouragement and impotency; and what have we left if we do not retain this?

The highest accomplishment and loftiest flight of the faith in personality is faith in the personal God. It is not necessary to declare to us how great a thing it is to think in spiritual terms of the Power that sustains and guides all things. We know also the difficulties with which this thought has to struggle, and that there is danger of forgetting the immensity and unutterable sublimity of God, for we have to mirror his being in figures derived from human life. Faith in God may never be separated from reverence and humility in the presence of the Inconceivable and Unapproachable, nor may it degenerate into a trifling familiarity which presumes to understand God and determines to comprehend his government, thus drawing him down to the level of human personal life. In the inner life of Jesus there was wonderfully combined with a childlike confidence in the love of God a holy and modest reserve in the presence of the God of heaven and earth, who rules royally and is without bounds in his

power. We listen gladly to the earnest advocates of modern monism when they warn us against the danger of conceiving God in a manner that is trifling and human. On the other hand, we must take the position that every exposition of Deity as nature or as the first cause of all that comes into being or of eternal being is a degradation; we hold that he cannot be more insignificant than the highest that exists in the entire circle of reality—the pure, self-existent, good Personality, the benign Father, the true Shepherd. While we hold converse with Jesus every doubt of this vanishes. In this personal life the being of God unveils itself; for his sake and in accordance with the vivid expressions with which he has favored us we believe in a Personal God, in the God who is Good Will.

This is the reason why we who have addressed you in these hours spent together hold fast to the memory of Jesus and protect it as a holy treasure. And this we do in the assurance that thereby we are doing mankind the highest service, that we are saving the salt of the earth and guarding the light of the world. Yet—and this is our final word—we do not at all lose sight of the fact that this memory

or recollection is not a work of ours. Not by our art certainly can Jesus be made a present reality; and he who thinks otherwise is not cognizant of the character of memory. Because memory exists only in ourselves and is a part of our inner life, it easily comes to appear as though it were an act of our own, a product of our free will; it seems as though we were the originators of our recollections, as if we could and must call the past back into life. But it needs little consideration to discover how misleading this appearance is. Memory is something received, not something done. While we may concentrate our attention upon recollection and cling to certain means toward that end, this comes about in the same way as when we direct our attention and thoughts upon speaking, as when leading a conference. But the content of recollection is not originated by us, it comes to us from without; we are passive, not active, in the process. We recall an event or a person; that is the same as saying that this (remembered) case has the singular property of reawakening to life in our spirit. Memory is a manifestation of the life of the person whom we remember.

We attribute to Jesus the quality of retaining himself within the remembrance of men always. There may be intervals in which the life of the soul is like the storm-beaten surface of the sea, when man does not observe in it the reflection of the heavens. But when the storm has passed, the sun again mirrors himself in the quiet waters. The memory of Jesus will change, as it has incessantly changed even till the present; each generation conceives it anew, sides of his being which have hitherto been unobserved are seen in more profound meanings. Those who are his, in whom he ever returns again to life, giving them incentive and comfort, courage and exaltation, experience in all this the truth of the saying attributed to him by the oldest community—a saying precious for the very reason that their own experience avouches it—"Lo, I am with you always."

# Index

# INDEX


## A

Adonis, 22, 25, 45, 46
Agni, 22, 23, 25
Antaeus, 227
Asceticism, Jesus' relation to, 166
Asita, 45
Augustine, 149-150

## B

Baal, 22
Bauer, B., 20
Benfey, 30
Bethlehem, 22
Bismarck, 213
Buddhism, 23, 24, 26
Burnouf, E., 20

## C

Canaanitish woman and Jesus, 160
Chamberlain, H. S., 13
Character, portrayal of, difficult, 120-122
Conservatism of Jesus, 137
Criticism, historical, 17-18, 191
Cross, the, 35-36, 44

## D

Döllinger, J. J. I. von, 29
Dogma, composite character of, 54-55; temporary value of, 52-54
Drews, A., 21, 27, 60
Dürer, A., 213

## E

Egypt, flight into, 22
Eschatology, Jesus' use of, 82-83
Essenes, 22, 36
Eucken, R., 5-6

## F

Faith, 182-183, 196, 229
Formulas, religious, 17-18
Frenssen, 13
Freyr, 31

## G

Gerd, 31
German folk-stories, 30-31
God, not to be described, 119
Goethe, 5, 121, 145, 213
Gospels, 26, 121-122, 191
Grimm, 30
Grünewald, 208
Gutzkow, K., 13
Guyot, Y., 13
Gymir, 31

## H

Hartmann, E. von, 13
Hathor, 23
Heyse, P., 13
History, how it lives, 205
Hochart, P., 20

## I

Irony, 104-105, 129, 132

## J

James, W., 153-154
Janus, 43-45
Jesus and Joshua, 22, 37
Jesus, apparent legalism of, 92; as myth, 22; as sun god, 22, 37; as teacher, 65; austerity of, 170, 174; authoritativeness of, 93; brethren of, 40-41; conception of his work, 136; conservatism of, 137; death of, 176; ethical perfection of, 156; faith of, 176, 182-183; fidelity of, to his work, 174; gnomic methods of, 103; historical place of, 194; ignorance concerning, 19, 121-122; inner freedom of, 158, 164; irony of, 104-105, 129, 132; love of, 168; manhood of, 119-120, 123, 183; mentality of, sound, 144; messianism

of, 139, 185-186; methods of studying, 55-57; naiveté of, 147; national prejudice of, 159; naturalness of, 140; "myth" concerning, 200-201; not an iconoclast, 67; not a social reformer, 87-88; orientalism of, 124; permanence of, 230; personality of, 6-7, 10-13, 119; questions concerning, 10-13; portrayal of, difficult, 121-122; power of, over people, 132; prayers of, 180, 184; present value of, 199; rationalism of, 107; relation of, to asceticism, 166; to present, 198; to sacrifice, 161; and to the law, 162; self-reliance of, 138-139; serenity of, 138, 151; sinlessness of, 155; teaching of, 68, 98, 113-114; temperament of, 125; work of, 210
John the Baptist, 44, 73-75
Jordan, H., 8, 9
Joshua and Jesus, 22, 37

K

Kahlberg, H. von, 13
Kalthoff, A., 13, 21, 34
Key, Ellen, 13
Kierkegaard, S., 13
Kingdom of Heaven, 72
Kretzer, M., 13
Krishna, 23

L

Lacroix, S., 13
Law, the, 90, 162
Lord's Supper and Buddhism, 23-24
Losinsky, E., 13
Luther, 145, 160-161, 164-166, 204

M

Martyr death, function of, 216-217
Melchizedek, 24
Mentality of Jesus, sound, 144
Messiahship of Jesus, 139, 185-186
Mill, J. S., 42-43
Mithra, 22, 24, 43
Modern Culture, 15

N

Naassenes, 38
Naiveté of Jesus, 147
Naumann, F., 13, 85-86, 210
Nazareth, 34-35

O

Osiris, 25

P

Paul, 25, 39-40, 148-149, 154-155, 202-203
Pauline letters, 39
Paulsen, F., 214
Personality, 120-121, 205, 218; of Jesus, 6-7, 10-13, 119
Peter the apostle, 43
Pfannmüller, G., 10
Pharisees, 126, 147, 201
Primitive Christianity, 201
Proteus, 43
Proverbial teaching of Jesus, 103
Purim, 24

R

Rationalism of Jesus, 107
Religion, primitive methods in, 65-66
Robertson, J. M., 20
Rosegger, 13
Rousseau, 42

S

Sacrifice, Jesus' relation to, 161
Sadducees, 128-129
Sargon, 23
Saturnalia, 24
Schiller, 209
Schweitzer, A., 9, 13
Science, freedom of, 221
Self-reliance of Jesus, 138-139
Serenity of Jesus, 138, 151
Seneca, 25
Simeon and Asita, 45
Sin, 214-215
Sinlessness of Jesus, 155
Smith, W. B., 20
Soul, 84, 87, 169, 218-219
Spiritual force, source of, 226-227
Suffering, function of, 214

T

Tammuz, 25
Temple, cleansing of, 129-130
Theological conceptions, 16
Therapeutæ, 22, 36
Tolstoi, L., 13
Tradition, 15, 122

U

Uhland, J. L., 30
Ursula, 29

V

Vollers, K., 21
Voltaire, 41-42

W

Weinel, 9
Weiss, J., 13
Widmann, J. V., 13
Wilde, O., 13
Word, as religious instrument, 65
Wrede, 9

DATE DUE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Demco, Inc. 38-293

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
232 B736jp
main
Bornemann, Friedric/Jesus, as problem, t
3 4320 00070 7333

232 B736jp

Bornemann, Friedrich Wilhelm
Bernhard.

Jesus, as problem, teacher,
personality and force

GEORGE MARK ELLIOTT LIBRARY
The Cincinnati Bible Seminary

232 B736jp

Bornemann, Friedrich Wilhelm
Bernhard.

Jesus, as problem, teacher,
personality and force

DEMCO